The LAFFing Parade

Lance Lindblom, president of the Nathan Cummings Foundation, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Council on Foundations.


Courtney Nelson, who served the Foundation for 15 years in a variety of international assignments, has reviewed that experience in a new book, The Making of a Maverick, published by Xlibris and available from Amazon, Borders, and Barnes and Noble.

"The several strands of my career," Courtney reports, "came together upon retirement when I enrolled in the Fielding Institute's graduate program in human development. This book seeks to integrate my understanding of the various vectors of development into a coherent whole."

The book takes its title from the fact that he was often at odds with his employers. "His unorthodox thinking and sometimes acerbic manner," it explains, "often challenged and irritated his colleagues and superiors."

Mark Sidel (Beijing, Bangkok, Hanoi, New Delhi) is president-elect of the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR), the international scholarly association promoting research and education on civil society, philanthropy and the nonprofit sector. Sidel continues to teach at the University of Iowa and served as visiting professor of law last year at Harvard Law School. He has books appearing this year and next on law and society in Vietnam (Cambridge); cinema, law, and the state in Asia (Palgrave); and anti-terrorism policy and the nonprofit sector in comparative perspective (Routledge).

A tribute to Ward by Francis X. Sutton begins on page 6.

F. Champion Ward, Educator for All Seasons

F. Champion Ward, vice president for Education and Research from 1966 to 1977, died in July at the age of 96. He was also former Dean of the College at the University of Chicago and Chancellor of the New School for Social Research

Ward's career spanned the postwar course of American and international education and included advising the governments of the newly independent nations of Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

After acquiring a master's degree in philosophy in 1936, Ward earned his doctorate at Yale University and received a Sterling Fellowship. From 1937 to 1945 he taught philosophy and psychology at Denison University, and as Associate Dean trained military officers for the army's de-Nazification efforts in Europe.

After the war, Ward joined the faculty of the nascent Hutchins College at the University of Chicago. He was later appointed Dean of the College and was made William Rainey Harper Professor of the Humanities. For seven years, he and Chancellor Robert Maynard Hutchins, whose Yale lectures six years earlier had fired Ward's commitment to reforming American higher education, fought side-by-side in the battle between their new interdisciplinary college with its core humanities curriculum and the university's departmental faculties.

Ward took a leave from Chicago to join continued on page 3
IN MEMORIAM

Clark C. Bloom, died May 28, in Pasadena, Texas. Bloom served as a Program Specialist in Amman, Jordan from July 1960 through August 1961. He was rehired in February 1963 as Assistant Representative for the Middle East in Beirut, Lebanon. He was appointed Representative for The Philippines on August 1, 1967. Bloom was transferred to the New York office on August 15, 1971 where he served as Program Advisor for Development Planning and Administration in the Office of Middle East and Africa until his retirement in 1974.

Condolences may be sent to his widow, Jacqueline Bloom, c/o C. Ronald Bloom at 6563 Spencer Highway, #2305, Pasadena, TX 77505.

Board Room Pyrotechnics

Unlike their corporate counterparts, the board rooms of foundations are generally peaceful, collegial stages. Jerry Anderson, who worked in the Secretary’s and Treasurer’s office in the 1970s and 1980s, recalls a fierce squabble. The issue was a $100 million grant to the Henry Ford Hospital. Although the Foundation maintained a small fund for Detroit charities, it no longer made blockbuster grants to organizations of special interest to the Ford family. The hospital turned out to be an exception, and the grant was made very reluctantly. The Foundation no longer funded hospitals, so why make an exception in Detroit? The answer, of course, was the Ford family’s interest. After prolonged negotiations, Anderson recalls, McGeorge Bundy struck a deal with the family.

To finance the major part of the grant, the Foundation’s treasurer negotiated a deal with a large Connecticut insurance company by which they agreed to sell an annuity for the benefit of the hospital at a discounted price. The deal had to be approved by the board’s Finance Committee before obtaining approval by the full board. But one of the prominent board members (name omitted because he still lives) objected. “Unfortunately for him, he really hadn’t done his homework, hadn’t mastered his brief,” Anderson recalls and so was from the beginning overmatched by Mac. It was a real dust-up. They went back and forth, and the temperature rose.” Bundy won.

Jerry@boston-investment-advisers.com

Housing Maven

Media plaudits and then some continue to rain down on Gabe Mehreteab, program officer in urban poverty (1981-1987). The last issue of the newsletter featured an entire column on Gabe by Bob Herbert in the New York Times. More recently, the Wall Street Journal ran a major article on Gabe’s efforts to build affordable housing in post-Katrina New Orleans. (As it turns out, the LAFF Newsletter scooped them both with a series of articles beginning in October on the prominent roles played by Gabe and other Ford alumni in the response to Hurricane Katrina).

The Journal article praised the efforts of the NHP Foundation, of which Gabe is chief executive, in breaking ground on developments in New Orleans. NHP, one of the nation’s largest nonprofit owners of low-income housing has received $2.5 million in annual credits for the 877 units it is in the process of rehabbing and rebuilding. It plans to build 3000 affordable housing units in the Gulf Coast region. But Mehreteab says his group’s developments are economically feasible because it received $10.3 million in philanthropic grants for post-Katrina construction, including $4.5 million from the state of Qatar, $3 million from the Ford Foundation and $1 million from Freddie Mac and the Freddie Mac Foundation.

He has been outspoken about the need to fill the “financing gap” by adding soft loans and grants from philanthropic sources. “Low-income tax credits are essential but fall short,” he says.

Finally, Gabe—known formally as Ghebre Selassie Mehreteab—is being honored as Humanitarian of the Year by the Eritrean Development Foundation at a benefit dinner in Washington.
PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE
This issue brings the sad news of the deaths of Champ Ward and Clark Bloom. It also includes reports on the impressive activities of several of our living members, an account of a recent meeting of the Greater Boston chapter, Will Hertz’s second article on the Green Revolution, and two letters prompted by the coverage in the Special Edition/Summer 2007 of How the Ford Foundation Should Select a New Leader.

Hopefully to be covered at greater length in the next issue, the Cairo office of the Foundation will be celebrating its 50th Anniversary (actually 55 years but 50 as a regional office) on September 9. Susan Berresford, Barry Gaberman and a large number of alumni, including David Arnold, Ann Lesch and Barbara Ibrahim from the American University of Cairo, are expected to attend. Thanks importantly to Emma Playfair, the current representative, and Yousriya Sawiris and Lily Takla, two former senior administrative officers, we are hoping to use the occasion to inaugurate a new Middle East and North Africa (MENA) chapter of LAFF.

Enjoy what remains of the summer.

F. Champion Ward
continued from page 1

COPING WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

Under the leadership of Ted Smith, its executive director, the Henry P. Kendall Foundation of Boston is now devoting all of its grant-making resources to issues of Climate Change and Energy. (Ted worked for the Foundation for 12 years, ending as representative in Indonesia. He then served as president of John D. Rockefeller 3rd’s Agricultural Development Council and founding director of the Consultative Group on Biological Diversity, which comprises 54 foundations and the U.S. AID.)

Long interested in conservation and ecological issues, Kendall began the shift to its new focus with the public assertion in December, 2004, that “climate change is the most profound environmental challenge for the planet in this century and we have a deep moral obligation to participate actively in the development of strategies and programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”

More specifically, Kendall “strives to catalyze a new wave of influential actions across New England that address climate change through appropriate technology, forward-thinking public policies and changes in citizen behavior.” It lists the following priority areas for 2007:

1. Municipal efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emission. This includes support for ICLEI (the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives) to encourage New England cities to be leaders in greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and for a large-scale, $100 million city-wide program to reduce energy use, fuel and electricity costs, and greenhouse gas emissions in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

2. Organizational capacity-building and policy action to reduce energy use and carbon emissions by energy producers and distributors, consumers, government regulators and policy-makers. This includes, for example, modeling/technical tools to inform energy policy choices by Northeast legislatures and major energy users.

3. Encouraging the reform of New England’s energy policy and bringing about higher levels of clean energy implementation. This will be achieved through the support of innovative financing mechanisms that leverage private financing with limited public investment and the creation of regional electricity markets for all six New England states.

4. The design and construction of “High Performance Schools (Green Schools)” throughout New England and Atlantic Canada. Such schools feature healthy and productive space; thermal, acoustic and visual comfort; indoor air quality; cost-effective operation and maintenance, and optimal energy performance.

Kendall also practices what it preaches. It conducts an internal “basic carbon footprint program” to reduce its own carbon dioxide emissions from office operations, internal paper usage and staff transportation. In 2005, it calculates, its small staff of five caused the emission of 42.5 tons of carbon dioxide—more than 8 tons per person.

the Ford Foundation and served as educational consultant to the government of India. From 1954 to 1959 Ward lived in New Delhi, India with his family. At a time of Red Baiting back home and Cold War clumsiness abroad, he earned Indian educators’ trust and respect by refusing to take any action until he had spent a year immersing himself in the country’s culture and history. He was soon enlisted to advise the governments of Burma, Turkey and Jordan as well.

Ward was born on December 30, 1910 in New Brunswick, New Jersey, and spent his boyhood and college years in Oberlin, Ohio, where his father Clarence was head of the college’s art department.

Beginning in 1959, Ward began a four-year stint as Director of the Foundation’s Overseas Development Program for the Middle East and Africa, and three years later became Vice President for Education and Research. During the next five years he also served as Chairman of the White House Task Force on the Education of Gifted Persons, and as a member of UNESCO’s International Commission on the Development of Education.

From 1959 to 1978, Ward also served as a trustee of his alma mater, Oberlin College.

After his retirement from the Ford Foundation in 1977, Ward served as a consultant at the World Bank, UA-Columbia Cable Television, the Association of American Universities, and the Connecticut Board of Higher Education; as well as the Ford, Hazen, Edna McConnell Clark; and Mrs. Giles Whiting Foundation. From 1978 to 1981 he guided the MacArthur Foundation’s development of its “Genius” grants. He also served on the Greenwich, Connecticut Board of Education, where he successfully fought to retain the town’s neighborhood schools.

In 1980, Ward was appointed Chancellor of the New School for Social Research and Acting Dean of its graduate faculty, which he worked to help restore to its founding, interdisciplinary principles.

He was the author of numerous articles and reviews.

Ward is survived by his wife, Duira Baldinger Ward, his children Geoffrey, Andrew and Helen; seven grandchildren; and two great grandchildren.

Enjoy what remains of the summer.
THE GREEN REVOLUTION: THE ROCKEFELLER-FORD PARTNERSHIP

This is the second of three articles on the history of "The Green Revolution." The first article dealt with Norman Borlaug's Nobel prize research in developing high yielding wheats.

by Will Hertz
with help from Lowell Hardin

The idea of a partnership between the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in international agricultural research was born in the late 1950s on the commuter train between suburban Scarsdale and New York City.

J. George ("Dutch") Harrar, the Rockefeller president, and F.F. "Frosty" Hill, Ford's international vice president, both lived in Scarsdale. Harrar had been the first director of Rockefeller's Cooperative Agricultural Program in Mexico, whose farmers had tripled the country's wheat production using the new varieties developed by Norman Borlaug. Hill had grown up on a Saskatchewan prairie wheat farm using mule and horse power, and knew from experience that science-based breakthroughs in agricultural technology were required to significantly increase food production.

Chatting on the commuter train, they started to speculate on the possibility of a joint venture in international agricultural research using the Rockefeller program in Mexico as a model. Such an initiative, they reasoned, would make synergistic use of both foundations' assets. Rockefeller would invest its expertise in the agricultural production sciences, while Ford would invest its funding resources, international prestige and overseas management experience.

Winning the support of Ford's board was the first and necessary step. Ford had launched a large, influential rural development program in India in 1951, but with disappointing results in increasing agricultural production. In 1959, moreover, as Indian food production reached a crisis stage, a Foundation-supported study recommended emergency action. After visiting Mexico, Hill now argued—successfully—that Rockefeller's Mexican experience demonstrated the potential in India and other developing countries for revolutionary changes in the way farmers produce food.

In 1960, the two foundations embarked on their first joint effort—the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in the Philippines. This was the logical starting point since nearly one-half the world depends on rice as a major source of food and rice farms cover 11 per cent of the world's arable area. With the Philippine government providing the land, IRRI was created as a private, independent, non-governmental entity willing to take risks in improving production technology. Ford's start-up grant was $6.9 million.

Opening in June, 1961, IRRI's first task was to build the world's first collection of rice germplasm. Using this collection as a source, IRRI launched a cross-breeding program of the most promising lines, developing in the next few years a family of high-yielding, short-stemmed rice varieties parallel to the semi-dwarf wheats in Mexico. These varieties plus other IRRI-developed technologies helped the world's rice growers boost rice production from 199 million tons in 1961 to 540 million tons in 2000.

With IRRI as a model, in 1964 the Mexican government and Rockefeller proposed converting parts of the pace-setting Mexican Cooperative Agricultural Program into a permanent autonomous institution to provide international leadership in wheat production. Thus was born the second Rockefeller-Ford joint project, the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT).

The Mexican government provided the land and continued as a co-sponsor. Harrar, Rockefeller's president, was named CIMMYT's board chair, and E. J. Wellhausen, a Rockefeller maize specialist, became the first director-general. Borlaug remained director of the wheat program until his retirement in 1979, but is active to the present day as a consultant.

Another key figure in CIMMYT's startup was Lowell Hardin, who had earned his Ph. D. in agricultural economics at Cornell where Hill had been his major professor and by 1965 Hardin was the top agricultural economist at Purdue University. Joining the Ford staff, he handled the start-up grants to CIM-
LAFF Establishes Beachhead in Boston

In its newest geographical venture, the LAFF Society met in Boston in June. The focus was, what went wrong in the nation's response to hurricanes Katrina and Rita? What are now the outstanding issues in rehabilitating the Gulf Coast?

Fourteen LAFF members met at the Boston headquarters of Oxfam America with Ray Offenheiser, president, and two of his staff members, John Ambler, senior vice president, and Bernadette Orr, Gulf Coast program manager. (Ray worked for the Foundation from 1986 to 1996, serving in Latin America and as representative in Bangladesh.)

"Hurricanes Katrina and Rita," Ray said in his introduction, "laid bare the effects of social inequity for the nation and world to see. The plight of survivors in the storm's aftermath demonstrated what happens when government fails to adequately address the needs of its most vulnerable citizens."

In a slide presentation LAFFers were told both of the unprecedented extent of the damage and of Oxfam's unprecedented response. More than 750,000 residences were damaged, of which nearly 300,000 were severely damaged or destroyed, and more than 1 million persons were displaced. The destruction covered 95,000 square miles from Texas to Alabama—the size of Great Britain.

Oxfam had been active in the area since 1993, starting as a small grassroots funder in six states on projects to address rural poverty. Following the hurricanes, the organization expanded and reoriented its program because of the scale of the disasters; the disproportionate impacts on poor, immigrant and rural communities; and the failure of government and many national organizations to meet the needs of these vulnerable populations.

Within a week after Katrina, Oxfam launched its first domestic disaster response in its 35-year history. This response resulted in emergency grants to 37 local partners for the purchase and distribution of relief supplies, medicines and food; an immediate fundraising appeal, which brought in $3 million; and the long-term assignment of staff members to the region.

Offenheiser and his colleagues were critical of the federal and state agencies and of the American Red Cross for devoting a disproportionate share of their funds to middle and upper-class communities at the expense of the poor communities living in the flood plain. These low-income families were particularly vulnerable because of their lack of political clout and the typical construction of their homes without foundations.

In 2006, almost $17 billion in federal Community Development Block Grants were designated for long-term housing recovery. Eleven months after Katrina and 10 months after Rita, not one house in Mississippi or Louisiana had been rebuilt with those funds. Further, relatively little of this assistance ended in the most distressed communities.

Oxfam was also critical of the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for prematurely encouraging the return of residents to areas infected by the spread of toxic wastes.

More recently Oxfam has broadened its program emphasis to include strengthening the ability of the region's distressed population to claim a larger share of public and private funding for affordable housing. This initiative includes coalition-building and networking of local organizations; research and policy analysis; and aggressive advocacy at local, state and federal levels.

These advocacy efforts have resulted in an allocation of $700 million in Mississippi state funds for local groups previously excluded; a FETA allocation of $1 million to one Louisiana partner; and federal action to make temporary housing funding permanent and to ensure greater state accountability for reaching low-income populations.

Oxfam's present program also includes assistance through partner programs to help local immigrants and other low wage workers rebuilding the coast gain fair and equitable wages, job security and respect for their rights. One partner, the Mississippi Immigrant Rights Alliance, has recovered over $1 million in unpaid back wages for nearly 600 workers.

Another new problem area is to ensure the quality and safety standards of rebuilt residences to reduce the risk of extensive damage from future storms.

To support its expanded program in the Gulf Coast, Oxfam has increased its budget for the region from $481,000 in 2005 to $837,000 in 2006 and has adopted a $3 million annual budget for 2007 through 2009. Its field staff in the Gulf region now includes four persons, backed by a policy advisor in Washington and a press officer in Boston.
Alumni Events in the Middle East

Service in the Middle East is contagious among Ford alumni. In addition to David Arnold’s presidency of the American University in Cairo (see article below), we now have Peter Cleaves, the new Chief Executive Officer of the Emirates Foundation in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Cleaves started with the Foundation in its Peru office in 1972 and later became Representative for Mexico and Central America. He was also director of the Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas and executive directors of the AVINA Foundation for sustainable development of Latin America and the Iberian Peninsula after several years as a corporate finance banker.

The Emirates Foundation was launched in 2005 by the Crown Prince of the Emirates to work in education, science and technology, arts and culture, and social development. It has approved several grants to gauge needs and capabilities in these areas. The next stage is to arrive at program priorities for a collaborative grants program with the Emirite public and private sectors. pcleaves@emiratesfoundation.ae.

MIDDLE EASTERN UNIVERSITIES

The presidents of four American universities in the Middle East made a whirlwind tour of New York and Washington in April. They included David Arnold, former Foundation Representative in India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka and deputy director for governance and public policy in New York. Arnold was executive vice president of the Institute of International Education.

He explained the purpose of the trip by noting, “The American public is seeing nothing but bad-news stories coming out of the Middle East, but there are some good-news stories out there. There are some success stories and these four institutions represent the best aspects of American education, society and culture. And in many ways, they’re the best possible face this country could be putting forward in the region.”

The other presidents were Joseph G. Jabara, Lebanese University; John Waterbury, American University of Beirut; and Winfred L. Thompson, American University of Sharjah. The group met with Secretary of State Rice, higher-education associations, think tanks, foundations, and universities. Their media rounds included the Washington Post, the Universal Press Institute, PBS talking head Charlie Rose, and the Chronicle of Higher Education. Following are excerpts of Arnold’s replies to various questions from Chronicle editors:

Q: How has the war in Iraq and the fighting in Lebanon affected attitudes in the region toward your campuses and on the campuses themselves?

Arnold: There is a level of anti-American in the region that is certainly at a much higher level than historically has been the case. Having said that, these universities are regarded almost as indigenous institutions by the people in these countries as much as they are seen as being an American institution. People regard them as their universities, not something that is being transplanted or introduced in any way. So we are American institutions, but we have strong, deep roots in the societies that we serve.

Q: Are there things that your institutions do to help educate Americans as well?

Arnold: There is a crucial role for each of these institutions in terms of building area expertise on and about the Middle East.

If you look at the panels of the Middle East Studies Association, our institutions are extremely well-represented in terms of scholarship on the region. We have a university press that brings out 75 to 100 titles each year, including a significant program on the translation of Arabic literature and of contemporary Arabic literature into English and making that available to Western audiences.

We are very encouraged by the efforts that are now under way to increase support for language study in Arabic, to encourage more Americans to have significant study-abroad experiences through the proposals and recommendations of the Lincoln commission and other similar efforts.

Because we are fully accredited, students can come and take courses at our universities that will be given full credit by their home institutions and be consistent with the quality of instruction and academic standards that they would be accustomed to at any other U.S. institution of higher education.

So yes, while we are very committed and focused on our role in terms of preparing and educating the future leaders for the Arab world, we also see as a crucial element of what we do, preparing and educating informed citizens and leaders in the United States, so that we avoid the kind of divide that seems to have hurt relations in the past.

Q: What about countries like Qatar that are putting a lot of money into higher education?

Arnold: Our institutions stand out for two reasons: One is that in every single case, we represent the gold standards in terms of university education in our respective countries. And second, we have a strong commitment to a liberal-arts education, which is different from what is being thought about and talked about at a large number of these new universities. They are looking at computers, engineering, business, but they are not building new liberal-arts colleges for the most part.

Q: Did you lose faculty after the fighting in Lebanon last summer?

Arnold: The faculty of these institutions is not there because they could not get a job elsewhere. They are committed to teaching; are committed to making a difference.

They are extremely talented teachers and dedicated faculty members. dnarnold@aucegypt.edu

The LAFF Society/Fall 2007
Choosing the New President:
Two New Views

In a recent Special Issue, the LAFF newsletter printed two views on the choice of the successor to the Foundation president, Susan Berresford. In turn, they have prompted two letters from Foundation alumni.

To: The LAFF Society

I applaud the devotion of an issue of the LAFF newsletter to issues surrounding the selection of the next president of the Foundation. LAFF society members are in a special position to make suggestions about the search process and the nominees because each has spent and important part of his or her life determining what the Foundation can do best in their fields of interest.

My suggestion is that an important consideration in the search should be the candidate’s time perspective. Foundations are uniquely able to identify long term issues which concern our planet and to do something about them. Governments and NGOs are able to work on current problems, but their scope is limited by the need to work on already defined threats, and to work within a four to eight year time frame. Foundations can look beyond that and call attention to problems over the horizon.

In my memory, the Foundation has notably done that twice, once in Freeman’s study of the impending energy crisis, now so much a part of our lives. The other was Gordon Harrison’s paper on ecology in the 1960s that stimulated an exciting concern for environmental action that is still on the Foundation’s agenda.

In the Bundy years, it seems to me the time horizon of the Foundation was shortened. Most attention and resources were focused on issues of great concern to the nation, but the concerns were current. The Board of Trustees was democratized, and more advocates of current problems were appointed to it. Good work was done in many fields, but not much of the far-sighted efforts of Freeman and Harrison.

Foundations are uniquely to identify long-term issues which concern our planet and to do something about them.

I have a neglected area of knowledge in mind that would repay concerted effort the human development dimension of the international development process—but I won’t expound upon that now. I only urge the selection of a strong and bold leader who is unafraid to lead the Foundation on uncharted paths. Someone like Dr. Lawrence Summers has the courage and intellect required.

Courtney Nelson
CANelson@sover.net

To: The LAFF Society

Courtney Nelson has given me a copy of his note to you and I am writing to endorse his suggestion that the next president of the Foundation should have the experience and the wisdom to focus on long term issues confronting the human race as we try to manage the resources and the environment on which our future and that of other species depend. To his two examples of past Foundation successes in anticipating future problems, I would add the Foundation’s several approaches to the global population/resource problem and the need to improve our social and economic understanding of that problem.

In addition to a long term time perspective, I think the Foundation and those it serves would benefit from a president with a broad geographic, indeed a global, perspective. As social and economic activities become more global in character, the ability of national governments to regulate them becomes increasingly constrained. National governments seem unable control effectively the activities of global corporations or the movements of people seeking better economic and social opportunities across national boundaries. While, in theory, the United Nations should be an effective agency in dealing with global affairs, it is constructed to reflect national concerns and ambitions and has often demonstrated its inability to cross national boundaries as, for example, in the case of Darfur. The Foundation should not seek to become an executing agency, but its resources should promote the understanding of the many emerging global problems and the alternative ways in which they might be addressed.

Edgar Edwards
edjeanews@symatrix.net
Remembering Champ Ward

by Francis X. Sutton

Best beloved of colleagues, Champ Ward had several distinguished careers, a devoted wife, three children, seven grandchildren and innumerable friends whose faces broke into smiles when his name was mentioned.

Frederick Champion Ward came to the Ford Foundation after Doug Ensminger came back to the States in 1953 looking for an educational advisor who might tell him and the Indian leadership what they could do to build a new nation with the schools and universities the British had left them. Phil Coombs once told me that he led Ensminger to his man in Aspen, Colorado, where Phil was then living. Champ was in Aspen that summer of 1953 as a pioneering leader of the seminars that grew into the Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies. He was then the Dean of the College at the University of Chicago and professor of the humanities, and it was, of course, Chicago notables who began the intellectual summing in Aspen, starting first with a Goethe anniversary and using Champ was a natural resource to help them grow into the Aspen Institute.

The fact that Ensminger found his man for the new India's education in a professor of humanities leading a seminar in Aspen, Colorado, was a quite heretical deviation from the normal searches for technical assistance in those times. These were years of great American confidence and optimism, with the Marshall Plan already showing brilliant results, and Truman's Point Four declaring that we had the skills and knowledge to lift new and old nations out of poverty and frustration. At a time when pharmaceutical discoveries were magically controlling old afflictions, and Europe and Japan were leaping to join America in the riches provided by modern technology, it was not fantastic to believe that technical experts might go out to far places and with education realize the dream of the philosophes, erasing the distinction between the "advanced" and the "stagnant" nations. Helvetus had declared the way: "L'education peut tour," the right kind of education could do it all.

The Enlightenment's trust in the power of education was above all in science and technology, and so indeed was that of the pioneers of development in the 20th century. It seems remarkable that Ensminger, a social scientist and agriculturalist from Missouri, should have sought out a Yale PhD in philosophy who freely quoted Aristotle and Heraclitus to be his chief educational advisor. Ensminger was bitterly critical of the English education that he counted among the worst of India's British legacies. But he was shrewdly deferential to India's new leaders and aware that a great many of them had had English educations, "complete with daffodils and skylarks" as Champ would say. The famous elite Indian Civil Service that laid had been humanistically, not technically, educated, and a man like Champ would seem "civilized" to such men and certainly to the Oxionians in the federal Ministry of Education with whom he would be working.

It was a long leap from Chicago to New Delhi, and there was persuading and "veting" to be done before Champ would take his young family there. But Ensminger was a persuasive fellow; he told Champ it was his plain duty to come to India and help it "come through as a democracy." The Bengali Oxonian who came to Chicago to size him up became a great friend, and the Wards went off to India, via the U.K and an old Peninsula and Orient steamer where he and Dewy danced and "chased the children from hazard to hazard."

One must dwell on his passage to India in telling of Champ's long and brilliant career at the Ford Foundation. India was then the cynosure or icon of the development business. There were experts as notable as Arthur Lewis who thought it too much the star, and Champ has said that in those years India thought it could "save" the world, and the world that it could "save" India. By 1953 India had become so big and expensive that there was a danger that Ensminger's vaulting ambitions plus the common American distaste for Nehru's leadership would lead the trustees to close down the whole Overseas Development program. But by 1955 the Foundation's work in India brought warm plaudits in Washington and elsewhere, and saved Overseas Development for the enthusiastic expansion and trustee support.

Champ set to work in India within the frame of Indian plans and conceptions, as was indeed proper orthodoxy in the development doctrines of the time. Unlike many American educators, Champ was not ignorant of and hostile toward the heritage of British education in India. He was scathingly critical of advisors who thought that the ways things are done "back home" could be transplanted directly to India. He sought to understand India's distinctive educational needs and ways and quickly established close and warm relationships with Indian educational leaders, working with them to adapt the inherited system to the demands of the new India in a broad array of ventures, rural and urban, from secondary schools to universities.

It was not only in his own work in education that he saw the necessity of keeping from letting American models and preoccupations obscure Indian concerns and preferences. He began there in 1954 when the Eisenhower-Dulles anti-communist policies led to political estrangement between India and the U.S., as we favored Pakistan for purposes insensitive to Indian mistrust of it. Champ was dismayed by the results he saw. The Ford Foundation had begun its overseas activities putting representatives on the ground and letting them take initiatives that would be listened to in distant New York. Champ's experience in India made him a lasting supporter of that principle of dispersed power and initiative. He also
international efforts to guide educational policy around the world that occupied him during the 1970s, he warned of the hazards of pronouncements “at a happy distance from any particular place where education is actually going on [and] no actual students or teachers obstruct the view from those heady lookouts.”

Under Mac Bundy’s regime, Champ was at first Vice-President for Education and Research in the United States, with some attention to the rest of the developed world, rather than to the poorer world he’d been busy with since 1954. He was fully equipped professionally, managerially, and temperamentally to do so, though the subjects were getting harder for the Foundation and for others too. It was a time when the Foundation under Bundy’s leadership was devoting itself to wider opportunities for all Americans, the sort of concern Champ had been serving for humanity at large in the Overseas Development programs. But it was also a time when the Foundation was beginning the painful contraction of resources that went on stubbornly through the stagflation of the 1970s and would continue for some years. Education, in contrast, kept getting bigger and more expensive, both domestically and internationally, and it was educational programs that bore the brunt of budgetary contractions forced on the Foundation.

Champ was to feel their bite first on the home front, and then in the rest of the world after Doc Howe came back to New York from India and Champ returned to deal with education for the world at large in the International Division.

By the beginning of the Seventies, the bright visions and wild surmises that promised new nations breaking quickly out of old stagnation into lasting and tranquil prosperity were yielding to doubts or worse. The world had responded to the dream of the Enlightenment that knowledge and education could transform nations through the dispatch of emissary legions of experts with modern knowledge and by producing an explosive growth of schooling in the poorer countries. A great deal had been accomplished, as the poor countries shared in the unprecedented growth of prosperity the world enjoyed after World War II. But when Champ prepared a paper for a gathering at Bellagio in 1973 of the heads of the World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, USAID, the heads of Ford and Rockefeller, and other lords of creation, he contrasted a primal “age of innocence” with a present much troubled by deficiencies and uncertainties. The growth of population had made nations struggle with demands for more and more schools for their children and they were outrunning their resources; jobs grew less rapidly than the numbers of school-leavers looking for them; and the early faith that universities and “high level manpower” were especially needed to assure the good use of modern science and technology after the itinerant experts departed became tainted with suspicions that it favored the well-to-do in poor countries. Old educational systems were hard to change and persuasive alternatives hard to find. With Rockefeller colleagues, Champ had assembled a panoply of experts to guide the leading agencies for development through this tangle of questions. In 1972 he was the principal Angophone member of a seven-member UNESCO commission that, as he wryly said, concerned itself with nothing less than all education everywhere in the world “today and tomorrow.” And after steering Ford policy in such matters until his retirement in 1976, he turned to helping the World Bank shape its educational work.

Thus it came to pass that a man with rich and rare talents in the actual practice of education, who had instructed and improved not only people who came to study with him, but everybody else who worked alongside him, should spend his later years wrestling with vast and complex problems of education far removed from individuals who might be touched by the sight or sound of him. It was at a further level of elevation and abstraction from what he had done in India although perhaps fundamentally not different. Commenting once on the Indian, J.P. Naik, whom he called one of the most stimulating educationists he had met anywhere, Champ wrote words that fit himself quite as well:

“It is hard to think usefully about education, and it is a measure of his dauntless
continued on page 8
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resiliency that he never ceased to think about that vast, shapeless and vexatious subject.”

These were years when people started to lose more general faiths in the planning and guidance of development, as the task came to seem too hard for governments, even when they were not notably, weak, wayward or self-seeking.

Much was tried and done in those years of sobered maturity. Manpower planning became more refined and educational planning more sophisticated, both internationally and in the nations themselves; educational research grew where it had been missing before; innovations were fostered seeking to fit substance and practice better to the nations’ cultures and needs than their inherited systems had done. Champ was conscious as he came to retirement that it would be a longish time before anyone would know how well these efforts would turn out. He hoped for a vigorous, itinerant successor who would chase about the world sometime, looking critically at what had worked and what hadn’t.

Much would remain unclear in his remaining time. But Champ was not dismayed by the new sobriety about finding ways of making education serve the progress of humankind. He had always been skeptical of clear and universally applicable formulae to make people better, from when he first saw them naively offered to Indians. He had an abiding mistrust of straightforward, linear projections of the course of progress, and limited faith in what he called the “calculative mode” of educational planning. The disillusionment with national planning and the more technocratic approaches to development that came in the 1970s were hardly a troubling surprise to him. His humanism contained a mistrust of scientific and technical self-confidence. The world as he saw it was intrinsically complex and varied, and it was no surprise to him that it looked that way in the maturity of the development era.

Champ thought himself a very lucky man to spend a great part of his career in the Ford Foundation, an organization trying to better the course of history for much of mankind, and with means large and sophisticated enough to make this more than a quixotic venture.

Green Revolution
continued from page 5

Borlaug called Aresvik the “tail twister” because, as a member of the Harvard economic planning team in Pakistan (another Ford-supported project), he was responsible for the timely delivery of fertilizer. Narvaez provided the technical know-how, week in and week out, for what became known as Mexipak wheat. He also established seed replication plots all around the country’s wheat-growing area, saving a few square feet at each location for growing Mexican chilies for his own and his family’s diet.

As a result of the program’s efforts, Pakistan wheat production increased from 4.6 million tons in 1965 to 7.3 million tons in 1970. The country achieved self-sufficiency in wheat production by 1968.

Narvaez received Pakistan’s highest decoration from the country’s president. Hanson, after serving as Ford representative in West Africa, became CIMMYT’s director general from 1971 to 1978. Havener went on to a distinguished career in international agricultural research, serving as CIMMYT’s director-general from 1978 to 1985.
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