

**CHARLES UNIVERSITY**

Faculty of Humanities



Anastasia Chistyakova

**THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND ITS SUPPORT FOR  
HUNGARIAN SOCIAL SCIENTISTS**

Bachelor thesis

Praha 2016

Thesis Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Marek Skovajsa, M.A., Ph.D.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank my supervisor doc. PhDr. Marek Skovajsa, M.A., Ph.D. for his patience, constructive criticism, guidance and for helping me access necessary data and references. I am also grateful to my family and partner for their constant encouragement, attention and support during my studies.

**Statutory Declaration**

I declare that I have written this Bachelor Diploma Paper, *The Rockefeller Foundation and Its Support for Hungarian Social Scientists*, myself and on my own. I have duly referenced and quoted all the material and sources that I used in it. This Paper has not yet been submitted to obtain any degree.

V Praze dne 24.06.2016 (in Prague, date)

.....

Podpis (Signature)

**Contents**

Introduction.....1

1. Methodology .....3

    1.1 Research Design.....3

    1.2 Sources and Analysis .....5

2. Social Science and Philanthropy .....8

    2.1. Social Science at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century.....8

    2.2 The Rockefeller Foundation, the Beginning of Philanthropic Activity .....11

    2.3 The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.....14

    2.4 Beardsley Ruml and Social Science .....16

    2.5 U.S. Philanthropies in the Cold War Era .....18

3. The Rockefeller Foundation in Eastern Europe .....21

    3.1 Hungarian Fellows.....27

    3.2 Selected Fellows.....36

    3.3 Analysis of the Foundation's Impact .....40

Conclusion .....43

List of References .....45

## **Introduction**

An issue of philanthropic organizations has always been surrounded by controversy. Constant accusations of promotion of economic and political interest of the upper-class through false pretension of concern about art and science is not an exclusive phenomenon of the twentieth century. However, due to increasing number of philanthropic organizations and unprecedented amount of disposable capital distributed in form of endowments and turbulent history of the last century, general interest in their activity increased immensely. Criticism, though, grew proportionally. Nevertheless, even being under constant pressure, newly established foundations of the twentieth century were trying to make a difference and, as the majority of specialists on the topic would agree, they did. The question of their influence is more concerned with the nature of their motives and subsequent deeds.

Although, it would be highly problematic to find a specialist who abandoned all doubts and controversies regarding non-profit organizations created as a result of surplus wealth and saw their activities as utterly disinterested, after detailed scrutiny of actual and historical facts, some might assume positive, publicly beneficial, role of philanthropic organizations. For instance, Martin Bulmer, who presents an extensive study of the Rockefeller Foundation and its influence on the development of the social sciences, argues that American philanthropy, and the mentioned charitable organization in particular, significantly supported scientific development, as well as, provided tangible help in relieving disasters of the twentieth century (Bulmer, 1993). Conversely, his opponent, Donald Fisher, expresses quite negative opinion in relation to new American philanthropies. Taking an example of the same foundation, Fisher attempts to depict its activity as corrupted by promotion of capitalist settings, which by themselves exclude the notion of impartiality (Fisher, 1980).

However, the purpose of my thesis does not lie in scrutiny of the nature of the newly constituted American foundations. Admittedly, there is always a place for various perspectives and interpretations when it comes to relations between wealth and non-profit aspirations. Despite this, current work does not emphasize this issue. Instead, I endeavor to expose an impact of a particular foundation on a concrete realm. To be more precise, I am going to present and analyze an impact on the social sciences made by the Rockefeller Foundation through individual fellowships rendered to Hungarian scientists between 1920s and 1950s.

My choice of Hungary was driven by two major reasons. Firstly, I was impressed by its history and rapid political changes that have taken place throughout the mentioned period of time. As you shall see later, I specifically focus on the manner in which socialism was implemented there, creating “probably the most totalitarian system ever” (Roman, 1999: 412). Secondly, archival materials on Hungarian scientists, who received individual grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, have not been systematized and analyzed before. It is my purpose to contribute to the topic by analyzing them and presenting in a broader context, which includes political tendencies, historical peculiarities and the Foundation’s policy regarding the social sciences. I am intending to do it in two steps. Starting with the historical background and materials on the Rockefeller Foundation and American philanthropy in general, I appropriate them in the second part, where archival materials on all Hungarian fellows who received financial support during the stated period of time are presented.

It is necessary to clarify the structure of the thesis. The first chapter handles methodological matters. These matters encompass research method and research questions. The research questions combine a number of issues crucial to the topic. However, their main purpose is to enable me to link individual biographies of the fellows to a relationship between scientific development and philanthropic activity. Theoretical framework, introduced in the second chapter, encompasses a brief history of the Foundation with a particular emphasis on its policy in relation to the social sciences. In this regard, one of its derivative organizations, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, plays an essential role in the formation of the Foundation’s attitude and perception of social science. In addition, path of the development of the social sciences as valid scientific disciplines, including major aspirations and obstacles that stood on their way, is summarized. Furthermore, this summarization is exposed within a context of political changes that took place in Hungary throughout the period of military dictatorship of 1920s up to the moment of October revolution in 1956. In the third chapter these historical attributes, gained with an assistance of relevant literature, are used in order to create a framework for subsequent analysis of archival materials of the Rockefeller Foundation. Through the systematization and presentation of these materials, I aim towards analysis which final point lies in better, more consistent, understanding of the relations between the Foundation and an impact on the social sciences made by Hungarian fellows. Putting it differently, I scrutiny the character and an extent to which the philanthropic organization enabled scientific activity and, consequently, supported the development of the social sciences in the country.

## **1. Methodology**

To begin with, my thesis is based on an assumption that the Rockefeller Foundation has influenced the development of the social sciences, i. e. it provided social scientists with plausible conditions for their study and research (Bulmer, 1984). Following this assumption, archival materials from the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) and a wide range of literature and studies connected to the issue, I am intending to find out in what way and to what extent the philanthropic body has altered the development of social science in Hungary during the first half of the twentieth century.

Although the purpose of my work does not lie in ultimate evaluation of the Foundation itself, (only of its activity in relation to one country during a particular period of time), I use a claim of its positive influence, which is based on actual empirical evidence, as a general guideline for the further research based on analyzed data. In the most vocal and profound manner this claim has been pronounced by Martin Bulmer. Although Bulmer is primarily concerned with a particular charitable body (The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial) and its operation within the frameworks of the Foundation's general philanthropic activity, as well as, with its role of an agency that "did more than any other agency to promote the social science in the United States" (Bulmer, 1982), his research and study of American philanthropy should not be ignored. Nevertheless, is it important to state that the presented viewpoint cannot be taken as a hypothesis for my thesis, i.e. the outcome, which shall be exposed later, is exclusively based on the data gained from the biographies of Hungarian social scientists that were given an opportunity to participate in the Rockefeller Foundation's program from 1926 to 1958.

### **1.1 Research Design**

Due to utter importance of biographies and social context, I have maintained a method of historical research which is called prosopography. According to Lawrence Stone, "prosopography is the investigation of the common background characteristics of a group of actors in history by means of a collective study of their lives" (Stone, 1971: 46). Prosopography can be used as a tool for research in social history oriented towards the discovery of hidden or implicit connections between social and political reality. As a result, it helps to expose patterns of relationships on a smaller (power elite, dynasties) or larger scale (social groups). (Stone, 1971). In addition, it should be noted that although prosopographic method is concerned with individual stories, these stories are usually related to a particular group, which acted during "a specified period, a defined geographical area" (Keats-Rohan, 2007).

My decision to employ prosopography may be justified by two major reasons. First of all, following introduced definitions of the method, there should be no doubt about a central role of historical occurrences. Earlier I have attempted to clarify an importance of historical context in my thesis. The archival data presented in the further chapters cannot be analyzed by itself. Put differently, the biographies of the social scientists and their achievements cannot be appreciated unless bound to circumstances under which they came to existence. Similarly, the activity of the Rockefeller Foundation should not be taken out of the context. Secondly, prosopographic method of research goes beyond mere description of a chosen period of time and enables coherent interpretation. Because of its multi-sidedness and struggle to reveal holistic patterns, it tends to maintain analytic perspective (Keats-Rohan, 2007) and may be taken as a tool for creation of general theories. Even though I do not intend to create a general theory that would explain the relations between the philanthropic organization and chosen country in a pointed period of time, prosopography is supposed to advise me on the possible manner of interpretation. To be more precise, I employ it as a research method that would help me to answer the main question of my thesis, which lies in identification of the Foundation's influence on acceleration of scientific development in Hungary throughout the first half of the twentieth century.

In order to interpret the way in which the Rockefeller Foundation influenced the development of the social sciences in Hungary, it is necessary to provide historical context in accordance with the mentioned method of historical research. In other words, before interpreting the data I have to introduce scientific and political tendencies that overtook Eastern Europe and changes in policy and priorities of the Rockefeller Foundation. By doing so, a number of questions should be answered first. Following the model suggested by Keith F. Punch (Punch, 2005), I have classified the questions into descriptive, causal, and relational categories. It is crucial to specify that the answers to these questions were provided by scientific articles, books, and archival materials and do not contain any personal evaluation or scrutiny.

The first category of questions is fairly broad and manifests exclusively descriptive character. Its sphere of concern does not go further than background and general causality of historic events. In my case, questions that belong to this category are:

*What were the state and role of social sciences (as scientific disciplines) during the first quarter of the 20th century?*



*What political tendencies overtook Eastern Europe, and particularly Hungary, in 1920s? What changed in 1930s? And what changed with the coming of socialism and Soviet influence?*

I need to answer these questions in order to show the most troublesome obstacles that stood on the way of the social sciences and which created the potency for their inferior position in comparison to natural sciences. It is significant to depict the specific moods and political inclinations towards turbulence and dictatorship that overtook Eastern Europe after the WWI and the WWII and the manner in which they influenced the whole perception of the social sciences.

The second category of questions is called causal and is preoccupied with the relations between various issues contained in the research. I have only one question of this type:

*How political regimes influenced Hungarian academia in 1940s and 1950s?*

This question may appear to be too broad. However, the historical process should be exposed in its continuity and it would be highly difficult, if not at all impossible, to see the development and changing features of the social sciences over the course of a short period of time. Additionally, the answer to this question will establish the connection and by itself explain a number of occurrences and hindrances that stood on the way of the spread of free scientific aspirations.

In Punch's categorization there is one more type of questions which is called relational. This type of questions is expected to identify relations between chosen phenomena. In case of my thesis, answers to the questions of this type provide additional characteristics for subsequent analysis in the context of earlier established inquirers of descriptive and causal types.

These question are:

*How many scientists proceeded academic career after the fellowship?*

*What was the number of fellows who decided to stay in the United States or Western Europe?*

However, it is crucial to note that it would be impossible to give answers to these questions without the systematization of archival data and, in this regard, I should introduce the system and logic of my empirical research that is provided in the further subchapter of my methodology.

## **1.2 Sources and Analysis**

The foundation of my research is based on the data gained from archival materials of the Rockefeller Foundation. The primary source of my contribution to the problem of the relation between the social

sciences and the philanthropic organization is manifested by analysis of information concerning Hungarian fellows (from 1922 until 1958) and their further careers and achievements. Consequently, acquired information would serve as an answer for the mentioned questions and interpretation. The systematized information was furnished into a table following the model used by Christian Fleck in his book on a transatlantic history of the social sciences (Fleck, 2008: 49n).

Name	Year of birth	Status	Graduation year	Grade	Discipline and University	Research topic and Duration	Place to study and Year of entry	Activity after the Fellowship
------	---------------	--------	-----------------	-------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

As you can see, some of the indicators are especially significant. To begin with, a discipline chosen by a fellow as a field of study is tightly connected with the Foundation's vision of the spectrum of topics that might have been useful in terms of applicable research (more specific information is provided in further chapters) and potential development. Additionally, it shows the range of aspirations and research areas in which social scientists themselves were particularly interested and which, they believed, could be enriched by the experience gained in American and Western European universities. Duration mentioned in the table also serves as a useful indicator, showing which studies could be accomplished in a brief period of one year and others that demanded more prolonged period of time spent within the program. On the other hand, it shows concern of the Foundation and its willingness to extend subsidies to the projects that were considered to be relevant to the current social reality.

Another important indicator unfolds the post-fellowship activity and exposes the possible advantages for the scientists presented by the Foundation. In addition, that is exactly the sphere of my interest as it shows, after a closer analysis, how many Hungarian social scientists contributed to the development of the chosen disciplines and in what way. Moreover, it gives an insight into particular examples of people who brought ideas and appropriated them in their homeland or, in other words, an example of those who, with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, contributed to the development of the social sciences in Hungary. However, as we shall see, due to various circumstances, which are about to be explored in further chapters, not all of them wanted or had an opportunity to return and work in their country.

Answers to the introduced questions and analysis of the sources within the context of created research design should enable me to discover the nature of relation between the policy of the Rockefeller Foundation and political and scientific tendencies in Hungary. This discovery, thus, is supposed to provide an answer to the main research questioned of my thesis, which is: *In what way the Rockefeller Foundation influenced the development of the social sciences in Hungary?*

## **2. Social Science and Philanthropy**

In the following chapter I am intending to present the historical background for both, social science and the Rockefeller Foundation. Most importantly, we will see in what state the social sciences entered the twentieth century and what were the major obstacles they encountered on their way to formation as valid scientific disciplines. The connection between historical circumstances and scientific acceleration that took place in the United States at the mentioned period of time will be exposed as well. Another significant part is connected to the Rockefeller Foundation and the beginning of its activity in particular. An emphasis will be put on a charitable body that constituted a part of the Rockefeller Foundation, - The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (The Memorial), which became the first organization that brought the Foundation's attention to the necessity of supporting social science. Moreover, input of Beardsley Ruml, the first and only director of the Memorial, who had a clear vision about the changes that should have been brought to the field (Bulmer, 1982), should not be ignored. Finally, this chapter is expected to clarify why the social sciences needed support of philanthropic organizations and why philanthropic organizations and, in particular, the Rockefeller Foundation saw social science as an area deserving the establishment of long-term financial and intellectual cooperation.

### **2.1. Social Science at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century**

The twentieth century brought devastating crises, world wars, and global catastrophes. Under these conditions, an interest towards the social sciences in Europe has slightly decreased. Nevertheless, at the same time in the United States of America the social sciences and, especially, sociology, acquired a status of applicable discipline eager to suggest ideas and solutions for practical problems. An attempt to see and understand patterns of individual and collective behavior, analysis of social factors and concrete phenomena, all of these proposed an applicable orientation of social science that would facilitate a move towards more advanced, empirical stage.

At the beginning of the twentieth century the social sciences were half way through their formation as independent scientific disciplines. Though they were generally lacking concrete concepts and clear manifestations of subjects of inquiry, it is said that the acknowledgment of their validity was steadily increasing (Kurbatov, 2001). Nevertheless, there still were some major hindrances standing on the way of their potential acknowledgement as sciences. To begin with, European thinking was profoundly influenced by ideas of Auguste Comte who is commonly associated with the introduction of positivist approach. According to positivist paradigm, science should not have reservations for any kind of interpretation, exclusively relying on facts and verifiable data. Only

those statements, that can be tested, are valuable to science, which ultimate purpose is to discover universal laws of nature (Hassard, 1995). Furthermore, Comte argued that there must not be any divide between methods maintained in natural and social science. Undoubtedly, a number of notable proclamations were made against this line of thought. For instance, Weber claimed that lack of plurality in opinion and method created conditions for the occurrence of “sectarian outlook”, which led to abandonment of all doubts and uncertainties that, in fact, were a moving force of scientific inquiry. Blatant lack of curiosity and stagnation of opinion in which it culminated prevented the development of social science (Weber, 1949). Appropriation of Comte's objective outlook subsequently caused a period of conservation of positivist views that lasted for approximately half a century in developed countries of Western world and even longer in the less industrialized ones. This tendency was primarily characterized by lack of novelty and palpable progress (Repina, 1998). Further obstacles are connected with the troublesome path of the historical occurrences of the twentieth century development and are mentioned toward the end of the chapter.

The turning point in understanding of social reality and distinct ways of its cognition was induced by the practical realization of manners in which knowledge was operated in natural and social science. Long epistemological debates ended in quite simple but immensely significant conclusion. Its basic outline embodied the difference among laws of nature and laws of the social sciences. Putting it bluntly, it was acknowledged as a fact that laws of nature were independent from the outcomes of scientific research, while social scientists had an ability to scrutinize social reality and consequently propose ways in which it might be influenced. Furthermore, gravity would not have ceased to work even if it had never been explained, but the roots of individual and collective phenomena and predictions based on their interpretation would not appear without scientific involvement and explanation (Nisbett, Ross, 1980). At that point, debate about the actual existence of social laws was still acceptable. It was the next step that is considered to be the breakthrough which made us perceive the social sciences as we do nowadays. During that step people (mostly those who were participating in academic activities) recognized social laws to be mere constructions or, in other words, theories of scientific thought. Social reality and its attempted construction proved to be more complex and multi-sided than it used to appear in the nineteenth century (Searle, 1995). There were no pre-existing natural conditions for social circumstances; what was called “laws” or “principles” was an outcome of continuous re-creation and transformation of the complex network of human intersections, which placed people as objects and subjects of their reciprocal activity at the same time (Repina, 1998).

Until now we have been speaking about the social sciences disciplines as having similar history of development and ignored variations that occurred during this complex process. However, in some regards, it is crucial to specify distinguishing features of economics from other social sciences such as sociology, anthropology, and history. First of all, economics has always been claimed to be “the most precise and practically reliable discipline” within the spectrum (Egorov, 1995). In terms of economics as both scientific discipline and sphere of social reality, it is possible to talk about actual laws embedded into the present day market system and earlier stages of its development (Alle, Egorov, 1995). Secondly, tangible progress in economics may be found already during the eighteenth century, particularly, in works of Adam Smith and his concept of “invisible hand” of market self-regulation. However, it was not just scientific curiosity that accelerated advancement of economics. With the beginning of industrialization process economics acquired a completely new position within the range of primary tools for satisfaction of social and political needs (Chiksa, 2006). It reached a level at which its theoretical approaches were directly reflected on practical application and, whether a particular assumption was valid or not, was discovered in a relatively short period of time. In this regard, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries other social sciences could not promise any immediate results for two reasons. One of them has been already cited and is connected to positivist aspirations to apply universal models and laws that were working for natural sciences. These aspirations, in their turn, caused poor implementation of methodology due to striving for certainty and subsequent lack of pluralistic approaches. Another reason lied in rapid and unprecedented changes within societies which were undergoing industrialization (Alle, Egorov, 1995). It should be mentioned that the formation of the social sciences as scientific disciplines, separated from philosophy and struggling “to understand the character and future of modern society” did not begin until eighteenth century (Ross, 1992: 3).

When speaking about the twentieth century, the history of the social sciences may be divided into two major separate camps, an American and a European one. The United States of America has always been an auspicious ground for scientific development due to its openness to new and unknown and liberal orientation that has been prevailing in political and economic policy (Ross, 1992). More importantly, in the course of the first couple of decades of the last century, the USA was not involved in any kind of open military conflict that would take place directly on its territory. Rather peaceful and stable country, it was seen as a better place by Europeans, who were directly affected by drastic political changes and open armed conflicts, and had to flee from their hometowns, forced to abandon their lifestyle, convictions, and plans for the future (Kurbatov, 2001). It should be pointed out that in the United States social science had more freedom and possibilities

to establish itself as a realm of self-sufficient scientific disciplines. Additionally, these theoretically based scientific disciplines were anticipated to fulfill their potential by solving practical issues and not limiting themselves to small academic circles (Ross, 1992). Nevertheless, historical retrospective of this favorable scenario may be misinterpreted by supporters of American exceptionalism, a concept, which exposes the United States as a supreme superpower preconditioned for higher achievements in development, especially in a political domain. Nowadays it is generally claimed to be a political fiction that cannot be taken as a sound historical or ideological paradigm (Ross, 1992).

At the same time, situation in Europe and particularly in its Central and Eastern parts was not so calm and steady. Although the roots of the majority of changes that took place in the first half of the twentieth century might be traced to the nineteenth century and even earlier, their consequences were impossible to predict. Lack of stability became the main signifier of the epoch. The Treaty of Versailles was supposed to stabilize Europe and help it to recover from the atrocities of the WWI. Nevertheless, it created an open space for controversy and discontent which did not wait long to unfold. Virtual recreation of geopolitical map of Central and Eastern European territories gave birth to a number of new countries and brought fall to multi-national empires.

This reconstruction was complemented by appearance of new ideologies that attempted to build completely different societies bound by new social structures. Some of these ideologies, for instance Marxism-Leninism, immensely influenced the course of scientific development. For example, history and sociology were reduced to justification of a single theory, perverted and intentionally misrepresented on many occasions (Kolakowski, 1968). Furthermore, such application of social science took away its core characteristics manifested in original curiosity and constant questioning of social phenomena (Repina, 1998). Although, in 1920s ideologies were imposed only in a relatively small number of countries (for example, in Russia, Germany, and Hungary), Europe was largely fragile and generally unable to provide sufficient conditions for acceleration of the development of the social sciences without an external help.

## **2.2 The Rockefeller Foundation, the Beginning of Philanthropic Activity**

The Rockefeller Foundation was established in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller, his son John D. Rockefeller Jr., and their business and philanthropic advisor Frederick Taylor Gates, who saw its aim in “promoting the wellbeing of humanity throughout the world”. Although the Rockefeller Foundation still works on fulfilling its initial aspiration nowadays, the purpose of the following chapter is to expose the roots of its policy and goals towards the support of the social sciences.

John D. Rockefeller Jr. wrote that “the best philanthropy is constantly in search for cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source” (Craver, 1986: 205). This quote may be taken as a brief but explicit manifestation of the Foundation’s ambitions. Creation of a philanthropic organization was not considered to be a novelty even at the beginning of the twentieth century. A number of strong charitable bodies had been already established in the United States and the Rockefeller family themselves had supported various projects through their earlier establishments (Bremner, 1988). For instance, the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research was founded in 1901 followed by the General Education Board created in 1903. The latter had a fairly broad spectrum of activities. Its major purpose though was to provide education for African-Americans. Contributing to education “without distinction of race, sex, or creed”, the Board received over \$324 million until it ceased to function in 1964.<sup>1</sup>

An essential characteristic, by which the Rockefeller Foundation may be defined, has always been its multidimensional approach. Putting it differently, the welfare of mankind could not be achieved by elimination of temporary hardships of human life (Fosdick, 1952).

As has been already cited, the Foundation was not the first large scale charitable body. The Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation were established in 1907 and 1911 respectively. However, the sphere of influence of these foundations was narrower and more concrete in comparison to the Rockefeller’s. The Carnegie Corporation, for instance, was highly concerned with the study of American immigrants in relation to educational opportunities for adults through lifelong learning programs. In addition, by the time of the Corporation’s official obtaining of the status of philanthropic body, Carnegie had already endowed over \$43 million dollars for the U.S. public library buildings.<sup>2</sup>

The charitable body created by Margaret Sage also recognized the central role of education in matters of social conditions and their improvement. Furthermore, the Russell Sage Foundation was exclusively involved into social science research projects.<sup>3</sup> An idea that was underlying its philosophy was “the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States”, which might have been attained through the practical application of knowledge gained in scientific research in the realm of social science. The primary difference between the charitable bodies of the twentieth century and their predecessors was orientation towards permanent relief of “human misery” by use

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/>

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.carnegie.org/>

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.russellsage.org/>



of empirically obtained knowledge as a weapon. Search for immediate but temporary improvement was no longer a desirable option (Craver, 1986).

Not all intellectuals and social scientist shared a positive attitude towards philanthropy and its charitable bodies that were established at the beginning of the twentieth century.

*Social science finds its first advocates among the philanthropists and the reformers, that is, in the enlightened avant-garde of the dominant who expect that “social economics” will provide them with a solution to “social problems” and particularly to those posed by individuals and groups “with problems” (Bourdieu, 1998: 39).*

Introduced passage belongs to one of the most influential social scientists of the last century. Although, Bourdieu was not primarily concerned with the philanthropy’s influence on the development of the social sciences, his opinion on the topic is clearly stated. According to Bourdieu, endowments promoted by the upper-class did not accelerate the scientific progress but, in fact, created the network of dependency and bias. This dependency subsequently manifested itself in pressure of social demand and prevented social science from progress toward scientificity (Bourdieu, 1998).

Another social scientist who, in comparison to Bourdieu, is rather vocal and writes extensively on the issue is Donald Fisher. He argues that modern philanthropy itself represents the distribution of surplus wealth and promotes interests of a particular social class. This wealth, according to Fisher, could go directly to the state in a form of taxes and, consequently, contribute more to the social welfare without displaying one’s privileges. His position regarding the Rockefeller Foundation has even more disapproving nature. He claims that the Foundation was one of the first charitable organizations which started to “invest” into education. In this manner, knowledge obtained by better education became a specific form of capital. This strictly economic approach created a context in which education became a tool or “means of production” that was supposed to solve society's problems. Following the same line of thought, Fisher accuses philanthropic bodies of elevation of capitalist interest in which social science plays secondary role, alienated from initial scientific aspirations by socio-economical domination of its patrons (Fisher, 1980).

The Rockefeller Foundation has been blamed for sordid behavior on many occasions from the moments of its establishment. However, one of the most demonstrative arguments was connected to the Foundation’s reaction to the Great Depression. For a brief period of time endowments for economics tripled while some projects in other social sciences had to be suspended or postponed in

their realization (Craver, 1986). Those, who criticize the concept of modern philanthropy and share Fisher's concerns, might see it as a direct attempt to restart American capitalism undertaken by the upper class (Fisher, 1983). Nevertheless, this situation may be viewed from a different perspective. One of the most influential aspects lies the fact that the Rockefeller Foundation never denied an importance of economic well-being of society and, moreover, acknowledged it as one of the primary constituents of human welfare. In this case, Fisher's constant reference to philanthropic activity in relation to capitalist empowerment may be seen as overemphasized (Ahmad, 1991). Focus on economic sphere should not be perceived as promotion of particular interests, but rather as fulfillment of the Foundation's mission to help people in times of trouble (Bulmer, 1982).

### **2.3 The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial**

When speaking about the work that has been done by the Rockefeller Foundation in relation to the social sciences, it is difficult to ignore the role of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. In the following subchapters I endeavor to introduce arguments which prove this statement and expose an outstanding role of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial was founded in 1918 by John. D. Rockefeller Sr. in memory of his recently deceased wife as a charitable trust with an endowment of 74 million dollars. The initial spheres of its concern lied in philanthropic activity associated with Mrs. Rockefeller and her late charity, which main concern was the welfare of women, children, and support for Baptist religious organizations (Bulmer, 1984). In addition, the Memorial was actively involved in the restoration of Europe after the war, providing emergency relief by support of social welfare organizations and subsidizing some projects in field of the public health. Although there was no particular program or plan for the fund distribution, 9 million dollars were distributed between 1918 and 1922 (Craver, 1986: 205).

The position of the President of the Memorial was nominally occupied by John D. Rockefeller Jr., who was not specifically involved in its day-to-day running and was to a large extent relying on its Board of trustees, which positions were occupied by businessmen, professors and public administrators (Bulmer, 1981). The issue that was especially problematic was not just the lack of strong directorship but absence of clearly formulated policy. This was true for the first four years of the Memorial's existence and sometimes made its achievements look undistinguished and vague. However, the situation was about to change drastically with an appointment of the first and the only director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, Beardsley Ruml.

It was Ruml (more detailed information about his personality is provided in the next subchapter) who turned the Memorial's attention to university education and, in particular, to the social sciences. Being intelligent and well-educated young scientist and administrator he brought along innovative ideas and suggestions that might have been seen as if not radical, at least as quite demanding. He believed in value and possibility of empirical application of the social sciences and was extremely dissatisfied with the current situation. Ruml himself wrote that the approach to the social sciences in the 1920s was "largely deductive and speculative" and, following the same manner, they were taught "on the basis of second-hand observations, documentary evidence and anecdotal material" (Bulmer, 1982). Nevertheless, the new director fully understood an importance of demand for a program that would guide the charitable organization and maximize its effort. Ruml also recognized the Memorial's general aim to make an input into the achievement of welfare and well-being of the larger population.

In this regard, Ruml argued that such achievement could not be possible without an understanding of major social issues that "required adequate theoretically-grounded explanation of human behavior, which only these social sciences could produce". Under "these social sciences" were meant "the basic social sciences, defined as sociology, anthropology, psychology and parts of economics, political science, and history" (Bulmer, 1993: 259). Due to the current state of the social sciences, Ruml realized that no immediate results could be expected and tried to shift the Board's attention to the establishment of long-term cooperation with research organizations, universities and individuals.

Research organizations were especially attractive for the Memorial. The reason might be quite obvious: innovative approach to the social sciences was assumed to bring along new methods and ways of "doing science". Ruml himself was one of the pioneers of empirical research in psychology. This might explain an extensive support for new empirical programs exercised by the charitable body under his guidance. The Local Community Research Committee (L. C. R. C.) of the University of Chicago may be taken as an example. To begin with, it is crucial to mention that the Research Committee itself was created in 1923 with the Memorial support and received more than 600,000 dollars from the moment of its establishment and until 1928 (Bulmer, 1982). The money gave teaching staff an opportunity to do research by providing replacement teaching. It allowed students to work part-time on L. C. R. C. projects by funding graduate traineeships. Finally, it paid for equipment, supplies and for additional staff to assist on research projects that required data collection and extensive analysis (Bulmer, 1980, 1981b). Noteworthy, the Memorial completely abstained from any form of promotion of personal interests. One of its primary principles was

abstinence from direct involvement into research process. Participation of the charitable body should not have gone beyond financial support for the institutions that aspired to promote new, innovative ways of practicing social science. Furthermore, from the beginning of the Memorial's activity under Ruml, it was officially stated that the organization would neither participate in any kind of social or political reform, nor try to conduct or influence research projects by any means (Kohler, 1976).

Although the history of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial was extraordinary and productive in its support for development of the social sciences, it was fairly short. In 1929, during the major reorganization, the Memorial was consolidated with the Rockefeller Foundation. There were claims that one of the reasons for consolidation was Ruml's activity. Some trustees saw his eagerness to spend money on education and research as excessive. However, there is no conclusive evidence supporting this theory (Bulmer, Martin & Joan, 1981).

*The main ground for the reorganization, however, lay in the organisational problems of the Rockefeller Foundation and the International Health Board. Inconsistencies and the incoherence within organization and policy of those bodies made a move towards amalgamation and rationalisation seemed to be desirable (Embree, circa 1930, quoted in Kohler, R. E., "A Policy for the Advancement of Science").*

The Memorial's social science program would be moved into a new division of the Rockefeller Foundation concerned with the social sciences. The Memorial would then either cease to exist entirely or it would retain residual responsibilities for child welfare and international cooperation (Bulmer, 1982).

Even though the Memorial ceased to exist as a separate body, the pattern and the general course toward the social sciences were maintained by the Foundation and subsequently followed. Ruml's legacy, embodied in the Memorial's principles, became an integral part of the new, scientifically oriented Rockefeller Foundation.

## **2.4 Beardsley Ruml and Social Science**

In order to fully understand the changes brought by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and appreciate the way in which it accelerated the progress made by the social sciences in the first half of the twentieth century, it is necessary to find out more about its director and his ingenious policy.

Beardsley Ruml, a 27-year-old of Czech descent with a Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Chicago, was a truly unusual choice for a director. Although, he had spent some time as an assistant to the President of Carnegie Corporation, Ruml was still rather young and inexperienced in philanthropic activities. Furthermore, the description of his personality, in spite of being positive, still suggested the possibility of occurrence of the future disagreement between the Board of trustees and Ruml's own unique vision (Bulmer, 1982). His character may be better understood through the following references:

*He had a calculated lack of caution, the enthusiasm and rambunctious inventiveness which had a strong sense of economic practicality underneath (Karl, 1974).*

*He has a creative ignorance which prevents him from seeing the No-Thoroughfare, Keep-Off-the-Grass, Don't-Trespass and Dead-End-Street signs in the world of ideas (Johnston, 1945).*

These descriptions provide a peculiar and to some extent ambiguous characteristic of Beardsley Ruml. Nevertheless, they give a reasonable context for the changes that were yet to come in the newly established charitable body of the Rockefeller Foundation.

It has been cited that Ruml was an active supporter of empirical research and its application in the social sciences. Before taking a position in the Memorial, he himself participated in one of the first attempts "to apply social science knowledge for practical use, both in the army in war time, and in industrial personnel work in peace" (Johnson, 1945; Baritz, 1960). In the army he applied his skills to create tests for the selection of military personnel. His input in industrial development was made by devising occupational tests and drawing up examinations for 120 occupations from apothecaries to blacksmiths (Bulmer, Martin & Joan, 1981).

At the time, when Ruml was appointed as a director, the Memorial was lacking concrete policy and the spectrum of its activities was too broad and vague. Immediate and radical changes were needed in order to fulfill its initial philanthropic aspirations. Ruml realized it better than anyone and suggested the program of action already during the first year of his appointment (Bulmer, Martin & Joan, 1981). As has been mentioned already, in 1922 the Memorial shifted its attention to the long-term cooperation with universities, individuals and organizations that promoted innovative methodology and empirical research in the social sciences. Ruml proposed five basic steps that would constitute the basis for efficient cooperation. These steps were initially offered as a plan for the academic year 1922-1923.

The first step would be an assistance to already existing strong centers of social science research. These centers were Columbia, Chicago, Iowa, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania. The key purpose was to help them to achieve maximum level of productivity by providing equipment, books, clerical and statistical assistance. The second step was to create a habit of personal visits to these research centers in order to identify to what extent the support was needed. Another reason for it was to select potential candidates for individual fellowships that were to start with the academic year 1923-1924. Thirdly, Ruml suggested “a survey of social science research being carried out in non-academic organizations, such as business concerns, advertising agencies and trade associations”. The next step considered creation of an informal committee that would advise on choice of problems, selection of suitable individuals and research methods. This committee would be concerned with the information provided by the survey incorporated in the previous step. The last step was particularly relevant to the initial activity of the Memorial. In order to advance the study of child life in New York, Ruml recommended to establish a research body on the model of industrial research of the University of Pennsylvania (Bulmer, Martin & Joan, 1981: 365-366).

Although not all of these five steps were fulfilled in accordance with Ruml’s expectations, they contributed greatly to the future policy of the Memorial and the Rockefeller Foundation. Thorough investigation of potential research centers, unbiased position of the philanthropic organization and further practical application of empirical research and diffusion of knowledge into open public realm became the foundation stone of the Rockefeller policy in relation to the social sciences (Bulmer, 1982).

## **2.5 U.S. Philanthropies in the Cold War Era**

For the American philanthropic organizations, the postwar years were characterized by tangible transformation of interests. This transformation was primarily caused by migration of European refugees and the tension between Western democratic and Eastern socialist blocks. While the settlement of European intellectuals signified “transfusions of European social thought to American academia”, American government, as “the leader of the free world” focused on the problems of underdeveloped territories and controversies caused by racial segregation as well as on the issue of escalating conflict with the Soviet Union (Karl, 1983: 16-17).

Security considerations immensely influenced the Foundations’ policies, which appropriated the role of the nexus between social scientific knowledge developed through individual grants and universities programs and public policy and practitioners. Following the model of “democratic

peace thesis” (DTP), American Foundations were expected to transform “theoretical constructions” to “political convictions” through “public conventions” (Ish-Shalom, 2006).

“The Big Three” Foundations (The Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie) played profound role during the Cold War period by introducing programs in security and area studies and promoting the development of international law and various transnational organizations, such as United Nations. Moreover, it has been pointed out that “US philanthropy was heavily enmeshed in transnational networks and had an impact on the foreign policies and internal affairs other nations” (Rietzler, Parmar&Katarina, 2014). An extent of involvement of philanthropic organizations into affairs of American government in regard to social and security policy after the WWII is undeniable, but the issue considering motives and possible exploitation of scientific knowledge is controversial and may be viewed from different perspectives (Karl, 1983). That is the reason why political debate on the topic shall be avoided in the current thesis and closer attention should be paid to the Foundations’ policy regarding the social sciences instead.

To begin with, for American philanthropy, international tension brought to light a number of completely new or previously ignored programs in social science. Already mentioned security studies, which before were occasionally identified as a mix of sociology and political science, gained a status of a separate academic discipline as well as Russian and Chinese studies which grew from language departments (Engerman, 1999). Psychology and behavioral studies were also acknowledged as highly valuable in terms of application in human affairs. The Ford Foundation, for instance, created the Behavioral Science Program (BSP) in attempt to “increase the number of competent behavioral scientists”, “make the content of the behavioral sciences more scientific”, “improve methods of investigation” and “develop institutional resources”. Although BSP had never been completed, during the several years of its existence the Ford Foundation endowed almost 43 million dollars on various purposes connected to behavioral study and research (Geiger, 1993: 101). Such financial support was possible due to the fact that after the death of its founder, Henry Ford, almost 90% of the capital of Ford Motor Company were automatically allocated to the Foundation and made it the richest American philanthropic organization in 1950s (Geiger, 1993).

While rather new Ford Foundation, established in 1936, was working on its policy and creating action programs, the Rockefeller Foundation already had a clearly defined vision in relation to social science. Activity of its Social Science Division, which overtook the Memorial’s tasks after its amalgamation in 1929, was largely continuing the program suggested by Beardsley Ruml (Geiger, 1993). Nevertheless, circumstances of escalating international conflict did not leave it without

changes. Similarly, to Carnegie it emphasized an essential role of international peace and “social adjustment within nations”. Its main input was made in international relations programs, which had been already acknowledged to be significant in 1929 (Geiger, 1993). Moreover, by the mid-fifties the “Big Three” reached the point when new programs demanded re-thinking of general approach to social science (Rietzler, Parmar&Katarina, 2014). It was mainly caused by consensus about low level of scientific training among scientists and practitioners and, consequently, poor performance research in university based centers. Still, inadequate conditions faced by social science during the Cold War era might be considered to be manifestation of unprecedented dynamic of social scientific disciplines. Never before had they been faced with such need for practical application. Under these circumstances, by identifying the scope of problems to which they could suggest concrete solutions, the social sciences were finally able to escape from inferiority complex that had been bounding them to the natural sciences for more than two centuries (Reisch, 2005).



### **3. The Rockefeller Foundation in Eastern Europe**

It has been repeatedly stated that the Rockefeller Foundation never intended to participate in the promotion of scientific knowledge in Europe. According to archival evidence, the Foundation was primarily interested in humanitarian support and restoration of Europe after the WWI. Nevertheless, the course of its initial intentions changed in 1919 when the Foundation decided to respond to Alice Masaryk's invitation to visit the newly established Czechoslovakia, which at that moment was barely seven months old (Page, 2001: 259-261). To offer a deeper insight into circumstances under which cooperation of such sort became possible, it is important to mention political and economic tendencies which were shaping the First Republic. First of all, Czechoslovakia was the only democratic state in the region. Mild political climate was favorable for rapid economic development, which ensured the country with a position in Top-10 strongest economic performances in the world at the time. In addition, artistic and intellectual domains were characterized by unprecedented freedom and encouraged by the government itself. These factors provided a solid international position, making the Czechoslovak Republic attractive for financial and cultural investments (Harna, 1993; Olivová, 2000). Although, the immediate cooperation in the field of social science was not established, the Foundation expressed strong intention to support establishment of medical and hygienic research centers. Beyond that, first five fellows were invited to the United States in order to participate in the program which for that moment had not even been approved (Page, 2001).

After the beginning of cooperation with Czechoslovakia it was only a matter of time before the Rockefeller Foundation would turn its attention to other countries of Eastern Europe. At the beginning of 1920s Foundation's representatives started to negotiate on the possible activity in Hungary and Poland. In its "belief in the universal benefits of modernization through the application of science" (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003: 54) it even went as far as to Soviet Russia. Initially, it was claimed that an attempt to understand and study Russian (or Soviet) perspective might have been beneficial for the "Western" knowledge. Putting it differently, cooperation in medical and scientific fields was oriented towards an establishment of international framework that would facilitate development of knowledge and, furthermore, would provide an insight for cultural studies (Solomon, 2008). In spite of high and progressive aspirations embedded in this suggestion, Russian scholars of history and philanthropy denounce this idea as being even theoretically impossible (Yungblud, 2006). The major reason lies in ideological convictions of communism which did not separate philanthropic organizations from the countries of their origin and were reluctant to assign any value to Western capitalist ideas (Lyugina, 2008).

In order to fully grasp the relationship between the Rockefeller Foundation and Eastern Europe, it is highly significant to identify the role of communism, which had been gaining political strength in a number of Eastern European countries in 1920s. Although in my thesis I generally assume the Foundation's political agenda to be neutral and try to focus on its actual achievements in promotion of scientific knowledge, there is a strongly pronounced opinion which directly connects all Foundation's activities and actions to an idea of American exceptionalism. This concept has been described in previous chapters. Putting it bluntly, it argues in favor of an exceptional position of the United States as being a country that possesses ultimate knowledge about the order of things and takes the promotion of this knowledge to be its utmost responsibility. Interestingly enough, these features fit into description of another powerful ideology that has been recently mentioned, i. e. Marxism-Leninism. Despite being taken as two diametrically opposite political entities, American exceptionalism and Bolsheviks' ideology had more in common than one would assume (Philimonova, 2013). Even though the philosophical concepts that stood behind them are not of utter importance in the present chapter, they, however, uncover and expose possible implicit contradictions that prevented the efficient partnership between communist (or socialist) countries and the charitable non-governmental body which abstained from pronounced political inclinations. Nevertheless, even the absence of visible ideological framework cannot guarantee impartiality. In case of the Rockefeller Foundation, it was noted, that the spread of knowledge and, consequently, modernization might have come with an embedded conviction, which directly linked "modernization" to "Americanization" (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003). On the other hand, some authors do not share this opinion and exclude the notion of political involvement from their analysis of philanthropic organizations (Bulmer, 1993). Notwithstanding, it is significant to keep in mind that the increase in ideological propaganda from the side of Russian Bolsheviks in Eastern Europe and strengthening of German militarism in Central Europe immensely influenced the Foundation's reconsideration about possible involvement in Europe (Page, 2001: 274).

As has been already stated, at the beginning of 1920s it was a matter of time until the Rockefeller Foundation would engage into scientific collaboration with other Eastern European countries. In spite of the fact that the Foundation's endowments to Hungary and Poland are dated as early as 1919, it is crucial to mention that the active support for social scientific research did not start until mid-1920s. As in other countries, the philanthropic body was primarily preoccupied with the improvement in medically and hygienically related spheres. Approximately \$3 million were distributed between Hungary and Poland during the inter-war period on medical and social science research. However, it is crucial to mention that only \$11,000 in Hungary and \$58,761 was spent on

the projects undertaken in the field of social sciences (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003: 64). It might be said that support for social science in Hungary was insufficient even in comparison to a less urbanized and progressive Poland. Nevertheless, there were some considerable circumstances which caused its insufficiency.

To begin with, in 1920s scientific development in Poland on a large scale was almost non-existent (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003). This was caused by the lack of governmental support that subsequently reflected in the shortage of institutions related to scientific research or science itself. There were also very few sources of philanthropy within the country due to almost non-existent urban middle class. On the other hand, however, the absence of engagement from the side of the government opened a lot of possibilities for the involvement of transnational and private organizations. For the Rockefeller Foundation it was relatively easy to apply its methods and means for the spread of social scientific knowledge without provoking controversy and conflicts in Poland (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003). Concerning the natural sciences and medicine, the situation was completely reversed. Backwardness and absence of governmental involvement, which created freedom for the social science, was a significant hindrance for the implementation of new techniques in the natural sciences. It was rather costly to promote new ideas in academic environment which itself needed to adapt to the reality of modern intellectual life. The Foundation decided that individual grants for medical and natural science projects with subsequent possibility to spend some time in the United States or Western Europe should have been more useful and productive for Polish scientists.

The Hungarian case was completely different. After a brief moment of being a socialist state at the beginning of 1920s, with the establishment of Horthy regime, Hungary became a military dictatorship. The country could not share the political and social freedom of its neighbors.

In the face of White terror<sup>4</sup>, social science became a potential ground for controversy. The Rockefeller Foundation did not want to intervene with the regime and preferred to support “politically neutral sciences” (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003). These “neutral” sciences were represented by the natural sciences and medicine, where there was no explicit ground for conflict. However, similarly to Poland, an opportunity to spend some time abroad working on projects in the social

---

<sup>4</sup> A militantly anticommunist authoritarian government composed of military officers entered Budapest on the heels of the Romanians. A „white terror“ ensued that led to the imprisonment, torture, and execution without trial of communists, socialists, Jews, leftist intellectuals, sympathizers with the Karolyi and Kun regimes, and others who threatened the traditional Hungarian political order that the officers sought to reestablish. See <http://www.globalsecurity.org/>

sciences presented in a form of individual grants was considered to bring more fruitful results and dangerous clashes with dictatorial government could be avoided.

Differences in support of various spheres of scientific inquiry may be viewed as unfair and somehow contradictory to the policy, which put the promotion of wellbeing to humanity as its ultimate goal. However, after the closer scrutiny, it becomes quite obvious that the Rockefeller Foundation did not attempt to equally participate in every European country. It also explains Foundation's selective attitude towards potential recipients (countries) and their political situations. Money, distributed among European institutions and scholars, were considered to be more of "investments" that would pay off in a form of scientific cooperation rather than simple charity for those who were in need (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003: 56).

Similarly to the privileged position of medicine and natural science at the beginning of 1920s, by 1930 the focus of the Foundation had drastically shifted to economics. This shift was connected to economic hardship that overtook the United States of America in the end of 1920s. Believing in the power of knowledge and its ability to deal with actual problems, the Rockefeller Foundation pronounced its aim to stabilize economy by means of scientific inquiry (Fisher, 1980). "Between 1924 and 1934, a total of 494 fellowships were given to young scholars in the social sciences at a cost of \$2,058,536, about 35 per cent of these awards went to fellows in economics and statistics" (Craver, 1986: 214). The money was "invested" into extermination of "industrial hazards" or, in other words, damages caused by economic instability of world economy. The tendency was passed on to Europe as well; demand in understanding and analyses of potentially harmful economic pre-conditions were seen as universal phenomenon (Yungblud, 2006). In this manner, it would be inaccurate to see this change as promotion of capitalist upper-class economic interests as suggested by Donald Fisher (1983), but rather emphasizes the Foundation's sensitivity to problematic issues and its willingness to participate in discovery of feasible solutions. Consequently, this acknowledgment of fragile state of world economy and immense importance of deeper understanding of existing problems reflected not only upon the Foundation's fellowship program but, additionally, influenced topics of inquiry of research proposals suggested by young scientists.

With establishment of communism in a number of Eastern European countries, perception of issues related to economics and other social sciences had completely changed. As has been stated earlier, communist ideology had complicated relationships with foreign philanthropic organizations. In case of Hungary, there was no exception. In the end of 1940s Soviet-type academic regime overtook education and scientific research. Mátyás Rákosi, who became General Secretary of the Hungarian

Communist Party in 1945, was considered to be “the first Hungarian pupil of Stalin” (Roman, 1999: 34). In relation to communist loyalty and close connection to Moscow, he promoted political obsession with possible conspiracy organized by Western capitalist countries on the one hand, and deviant socialism of Tito’s regime on the other. However, what is more important for the current topic is the way in which Rákosi’s aspirations, to be as close to Russian political and ideological system as possible, influenced Hungarian academia and social science in particular.

During the implementation and further application of Marxism-Leninism and Stalinism in Hungary, “humanities and social sciences were generally neglected” (Roman, 1999: 72). Only political science, which started to gain importance in academic circles already in 1945, could boast to have a privileged position similar to the natural sciences (Péteri, 1998). As one of the most prominent Hungarian scientists, who received Nobel Prize in medicine, Albert Szent-Györgyi, wrote: *[Natural science] is the highest school of thinking. If there is a Supreme Wisdom that has created the universe, let it be called God of Natural Law, then its only manifestation is the universe itself and natural science is the reading in the book of this Wisdom... (Albert, Szent-Györgyi, Tudomány [Science], Tudomány 1 (December 1945), p. 101 in Péteri, 1998: 34).*

Neglect, expressed towards social science, might be explained by the fact that its most important and controversial questions were already provided with answers. Loyalty and acceptance of principles, suggested by Marxism-Leninism, were the primary virtues for a social scientist in 1940s-1950s. As Kolakowski (1968) wrote, Marxism was more suitable as an institutional concept rather than intellectual. Across the borders of Soviet Union and its satellite states, knowledge about social and cultural phenomena was aiming to become universal, unified for all the people under intellectual vanguardship of the Communist Party. In “Toward a Marxist Humanism” (1968) Kolakowski introduces this assumption in a following way:

*It is precisely for this reason, because of the institutional rather than the intellectual character of Marxism, that a true Marxist will profess beliefs he does not necessarily understand. In 1950 Marxist knew that Lysenko's theory of heredity was correct, that Hegel represented the aristocratic reaction to the French Revolution, that Dostoevski was a decadent and Babaevski a great writer, that Suvorov served the cause of progress, and also that the resonance theory in chemistry was reactionary nonsense. Every 1950 Marxist knew these things even if he had never heard of chromosomes, had no idea what century Hegel lived in, had never read one of Dostoevski's books or studied a high-school chemistry textbook. To a Marxist, all this is absolutely unnecessary so long as the content of Marxism is determined by the Office.*

Furthermore, in countries where boundaries of scientific knowledge were set and methods with which this knowledge should be achieved were introduced by governmental pressure, it still was not enough to be a Marxist in order to be a respected intellectual and a member of academy. For instance, György Lukács, a Hungarian Marxist thinker, became one of the first targets of Soviet criticism. According to communist authorities, his book “The History of Class Consciousness” was “misleading of contemporary cultural realities” (Roman, 1999: 79).

Tangible relaxation of communist dogmatism came to Hungary with an appointment of Imre Nagy as Chairmen of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People’s Republic in 1954. Similarly to Dubček, who aspired to implement “socialism with a human face” in 1960s in Czechoslovakia, Nagy promised new, more pluralistic, political future for Hungary by maintenance of “human version of communism” (Roman, 1999: 256). One of the possible reasons for this political course might have been “the economic, political, and social crisis of the early 1950s”, which “forced important section of the Communist political elite to consider freeing the day-to-day political management of economic and social affairs from ideology and propaganda” (Péteri, 1998: 155). Notwithstanding possible improvement in social and intellectual domains, the relaxation did not last long, ending with a cruel suppression of Hungarian Uprising by Soviet army in 1956.

Before introducing a detailed analysis of Hungarian fellows and their achievements, it is important to outline the basic features that characterized the Foundation's participation in the promotion of knowledge in Eastern Europe. On the one hand, as has been mentioned earlier, the philanthropic organization had never considered a promotion of advanced scientific knowledge in Eastern Europe before the Czechoslovak invitation. On the other hand, once they accepted it and realized a potential of Central and Eastern Europe, the philanthropic organization had to manage to create a plausible framework for further cooperation. However, it could not go without some complications. The primary source for these complications were radical political changes which overtook the major part of Eastern Europe and reflected in various spheres of human activity, including cultural and scientific development (Philimonova, 2013). These political changes rarely brought democracy (for example, military dictatorship in Hungary, forced acceptance of communism in Poland), but rather established harsh conditions of totalitarianism and constrain. In most cases, it was based on ideology that rejected the fundamental convictions of the Foundation and philanthropy in general. For instance, in Hungary the cooperation in the field of social science was immensely complicated by nationalism brought by the Horthy regime. Another issue was connected to the fact that various countries within Eastern Europe were greatly varying in the level of scientific development (Buxton, 2003). Under such circumstances, the Rockefeller Foundation was facing a difficult task. While

attempting to stay impartial (even in the face of dictatorial ideologies), it had to be sensible to the countries' unique conditions and capabilities. Although “its policies were not designed to fit the cultural, political, and academic conditions of either Hungary or Poland” (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003: 71), the Foundation endeavored to be sensible to the counties’ unique conditions and, when it failed to do so, its representatives still attempted to establish individual contact with scientists through the fellowship program.

### **3.1 Hungarian Fellows<sup>5</sup>**

Although it has been claimed that support for the social sciences in Eastern Europe at 1920s was “almost negligible” (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003: 54) and was lacking a unified program for the spread of scientific knowledge, occasionally failing to recognize the specificity of the area (Craver, 1986), it would be an imprudent not to consider the factual contribution made by the Rockefeller Foundation. In order to analyze this contribution and attempt to interpret it, I have systematized archival data related to Hungarian fellows who received an opportunity to work on their projects in progressive and innovative universities of the United States and Western Europe. Furthermore, I have tried to expose the influence of this experience in the later stages of scholars' careers in academia or commercial sector. As we shall see, for some of them collaboration with the Foundation became a solid ground for profound achievements that have enriched not only Hungarian social sciences but advanced the scientific knowledge in general. Yet, before moving to fellow’ achievements and analysis of the Foundation’s impact, it is necessary to provide an overview of scholars who received endowments for research in the social sciences during the period of 1926-1958.

---

<sup>5</sup> Description and analysis presented in subchapters 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 are primarily based on the fellows’ index cards accessed from the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

Table 1.

Name	Year of birth	Status	Graduation year	Grade	Discipline and University	Research topic and Duration	Place to study and Year of entry	Activity after the Fellowship <sup>6</sup>
Deak, Francis	1899	unknown	1925	Dr. Jur.	International Law, University of Budapest	Codification and teaching of International Law, 1 year	Columbia University, 1926	An executive associate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1961
Balogh, Thomas	1905	unknown	1927	Dr. Pol. Sc.	Economics, University of Budapest	Change of relations between money markets of Europe and America, 2 years	Columbia University, Harvard, Universities of England and France, 1928	Employed in financial firm in London, 1934
Kardos, Ludwig	unknown	unknown	1929	Ph. D.	Psychology, University in Vienna	Development of concept of numbers in various races and in children, 2 years	Columbia University, 1929	Associate Professor of Psychology, Wells Colledge, New York, 1931
Nekam, Alexander	1905	unknown	1926 1927	Dr. Jur. Dipl. Ec. Sc. Pol.	Law, University of Budapest Economics, University in Paris	Comparative study of law of corporations, 1 year	Harvard, 1929	Professor of Northwestern Law School, Chicago, 1960
Surany-Unger, Theodor	1898	married	1921	Ph. D.	Economics, University of Budapest	Economics in the United States, 1 year  The relation between economic theory and practice in field of international trade with particular reference to problem of social needs, 9 months	University is not mentioned, 1929  Independent research in libraries in Switzerland and Germany, 1931	Publishing and lecturing in Europe, 1955
Judik, Joseph	1891	married	1915	Dr.	Law and Politics, University of Cluj	Problems of banking policy and work in general economic theory, 1 year	University is not mentioned, 1930	Position in Studies Division of National Bank of Hungary, 1946
Zelovich, Laszlo	1895	single	1928	Ph. D.	Economics, Technical University of Budapest	Problems in agricultural marketing and speculation in agricultural products	Columbia University, 1930	Position in the Economics Section of Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1934

<sup>6</sup> According to materials retrieved from the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).



Theiss, Edward	1899	married	1931	Dr.	Economics, University of Budapest	Business cycles, statistical research methods, dynamical economic phenomena in relation to business fluctuations and time of investment of capital, 1 year  To continue the research, 1 year	Columbia University, University of Chicago, Harvard, 1931  Columbia University, Harvard, etc., 1932	A member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1946
deBoer, Alexis	1898	single	1922	Dr.	Economics, Francis Joseph University of Szeged	Policy of central banks, international credit and foreign trade in relation to business cycles, 1 year	Yale University, 1931	No academic activity after 1932 due to serious illness
De Némethy, Imre	1898	married	1921	Dr. Juris.	Law, University of Budapest	Public administration, organization of governmental administrative services, 1 year	Columbia University, Harvard Law School, etc., 1932	A clerk in the government of the City of New York, 1965
Angyal, Andras	1902	married	1928	Ph. D.	Psychology, University of Vienna	The connection between culture and sociology from a psychiatric perspective, 1 year	Yale University, 1932	Private Psychiatric Practice in Boston, 1950
Deseo, Anthony	1900	single	1924	Dr. Sc. Econ.	Economics, University of Budapest	The influence of the world crisis upon the financial structure of the Great Britain and other countries, 1 year  To continue the research, 3 months	London School of Economics, 1932  London School of Economics, 1936	A position in Ministry of Finance in Budapest, 1936
Buday, Kalman	1904	single	1930	Dr.	Economics, University of Budapest	Theory of money and credit, trend of international capital movements, 1 year  To continue the research, 4 months	New York University, 1933  New York University, 1934	A secretary of the Hungarian Coordinating Committee, 1938

Havas, Eugene	1899	single	1926	Dr.	Economics and Political Sciences, Oxford	Effects of the crisis on the financial and economic structure of America, 1 year  Financial problems arising out of policies of administration in the U. S., 1 year  Studies in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance in the U. S., 1 year  To prolong the current studies, 1 year	Harvard and other American universities, 1933  Harvard, Columbia University, etc., 1934  1935  1936	Unofficial financial observer for the Hungarian Government, 1937
Kertesz, Stephen	1904	married	1926 1928	Dr. Dr.	Juridical Sciences, University of Budapest  Inst. Des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Paris	The problem of international responsibility of states, 1 year  To continue the research, 9 months	Yale University, 1935  Yale University, Oxford, 1936	Professor of Political Science at University of Notre Dame, 1955
Kardos, Bela	1902	single	1929	Dr.	Economics, University of Budapest	Organization of economic, social and professional statistics, 1 year	Harvard University, 1934	An assistant to Director of the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Statistical Society, 1935
Szladits, Imre	1906	single	1930 1932	Dr. Sci. Dr. Econ.	University in Szeged  University in Budapest	Influence of research in agricultural economics upon the development of agricultural production and marketing and upon rural administration, 1 year  To familiarize himself with recent American methods of assuring standartization of agricultural methods, 1 year	University of Wisconsin, University of Texas, University of Illinois, 1934  University of California, Stanford University, etc., 1939	A research assistant in Centre National de Recherches Agronomiques in France, 1950

Szell, John	1901	married	1925	Dr.	Law, University of Budapest	General theoretical training in economics, 1 year  To continue the training, 1 year	London, 1936  Yale, Harvard, Chicago University, 1937	Employed by the BBC at its Monitoring Service in England, 1950
Váli, Francis Albert	1905	married	1927 1932	Dr. Ph.D.	Law, Pázmány Peter University, Budapest  Law, London School of Economics and Political Science	To study international law at research centres in England, Holland, France and the U. S., 1 year  To continue the research, 1 year	Universities in Europe and the U. S., 1956  American universities including Harvard and University of Massachusetts, 1957	Professor in the Department of Government at the University of Massachusetts, 1961
Kun, Joseph	1931	single	1956	BA	Intercultural Studies, Eotvoes Lorand University, Budapest	Intercultural understanding, study of Chinese-Soviet relations, 1 year	Yale University, 1957	Pursued scholar career, 1958
Lazar, Janos Istvan	1929	single	1954	Dr.	History, University of Budapest	The history of modern diplomacy and general history of Eastern Europe, 1 year  To continue the research, 1 year	Harvard University, 1957  Harvard University, 1958	A partner and the head of research of Thomas and McKinnon, 1967
Mihaly, Zoltan Mario	1926	married	1950	Dr.	Legal Sciences, Pázmány Peter University	To continue studies on international public law and on comparative developments of Russian, Hungarian and Czech domestic laws, 1 year  To continue the current research, 5 months	Harvard University, 1957  Harvard University, 1958	Unknown
Balassa, Bela	1928	single	1950	Dr.	Political Science and Law, Pázmány Peter University	International economics, national accounting and planning, 1 year  To continue the research, 6 months	Yale University, 1957  Yale University, 1958	Professor at John Hopkins University, 1966

Balintfy, Joseph L.	1924	divorced	1948	Dr.	Economics, University of Technical Sciences	Advanced training in operational research, industrial economics, 1 year  To prolong the studies, 4 months	John Hopkins University, 1957  John Hopkins University, 1958	A full time research assistant at John Hopkins University, 1959
---------------------	------	----------	------	-----	---	---	--	---

Table 2.

Halasz, Imre	1925	single	1950	unknown	Building Science, University of Technical Science, Budapest	Study of architecture and design, 1 year	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957	No information about further activity
Zsuffa, Joseph	1932	married	1955	unknown	Hungarian Theatre and Film Academy	Film writing and production, 1 year	University of California, 1957	Zsuffa's picture "The Blue of the Sky" was presented at the U.S. entry at the Cannes and Locarno International Festivals

As you may observe, there are two tables. The second one presents information considering the fellows who, although received fellowships under the terms of research program in the social sciences, were not directly involved into scientific activity. Imre Halasz attempted not only to proceed his study of architecture but intended to find a refuge in the United States with the Foundation's support. Unfortunately, there is no further information concerning his activity after the end of his fellowship. Another fellow, Joseph Zsuffa, who was also known as John Ralmon stayed in the U.S. and pursued a career of a movie director.

As has been already stated in chapter on methodology, the design for the table was borrowed from the book on a transatlantic history of the social sciences written by Christian Fleck (2011). My choice was mainly driven by the clear structure and its advantage in possibility to focus on specific poles and indicators and emphasize information about the fellows which is of present concern. In addition, the introduced design was beneficial for my topic of inquiry and created opportunity for further, unproblematic, interpretation of the table. To begin with, it is significant to explain the table's poles and their roles in the overall topic of the research. As you can see, there are eight poles following the names. Their purpose is to provide a holistic pattern of necessary information

regarding each fellow and, furthermore, to uncover and expose crucial issues related to prosopographic link between individual biographies and large context.

There is one more significant aspect connected to the pole which indicates the year of entry. It provides information about a suspension of the fellowships caused by the WWII and subsequent establishment of Communist regime in Hungary in 1940s. Judging by the archival materials, there was a 17 years gap in individual grants for social scientists in Hungary.

The last grants before the break were received in 1939 (Imre Szladits) and the endowments were not renewed until 1956 (Albert Francis Váli). This may be interpreted in two different ways. According to Earlene Craver, by the 1940 the Rockefeller Foundation has lost interest in supporting the social sciences and terminated “all institutional grants and the European fellowship programme” (Craver, 1986: p. 221). Nevertheless, there is another opinion on the issue that brings a sound argument. Some authors (Fosdick, 1952; Philimonova, 2013) claim that philanthropic bodies had a tendency to keep their proclaimed programs. In case of the Rockefeller Foundation, it might be assumed that the social sciences did not lose their position within the general priorities of the philanthropic organization but the manner in which they were perceived had changed. Before the beginning of WWII, the social sciences yet were under a great amount of pressure put both by governmental organizations and social sector. Social scientists were facing many crucial problems and were expected to give propose fast and sufficient answers to the questions that were at the top of an agenda. Besides their involvement in intelligent services, in the United States social scientists were managing to cope with important issues related to migration, agricultural problems, industrial relations and public administration (Fosdick, 1952). In this regard, it was chaotic time for the Rockefeller Foundation which, in relation to other countries, was primarily focused on humanitarian support (Bremner, 1988).

Another significant poles expose disciplines and research projects proposed by the fellows. The correlation between the two gives a deeper insight into the academic tendencies of the period and allows to indicate importance of interdisciplinary projects. For instance, though some scholars were studying law, they were more interested in research in economics; Joseph Judik, who initially studied law and politics, chose to explore general economic theory and problems of banking policy; John Szell applied his knowledge of law to investigate economic theory, etc. As has been already cited in a previous chapter, by 1930s the majority of endowments, provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, was directed towards the development of business and economic knowledge and its direct application unto existing problems (Craver, 1986). In other words, the focus shifted towards

the solution of exited crisis in world economics. Accordingly, the data provides an information about the fellows who entered the program in 1926 and later. This might justify the fact that 13 out of 24 participants were suggesting research projects which were directly related to economics. In comparison, just two fellows were approved for training in psychology and only one suggested a project in history.

Scholars of law and politics, on the most occasions, were submitting offers connected to organization and improvement of administrative service, study of governmental administration and corporate law (for example, Imre De Némethy, Alexander Nekam), additionally, as has been mentioned earlier, in some cases they preferred to work in the field of economic and proposed topics that were closely connected to interconnection between law or politics. Another issue considering the research topics should be pointed out. Some proposals were suggesting a clearly defined purpose and detailed plan for research: “problems of governmental and administrative services and their organization and coordination” (Imre De Némethy), or, for instance, “development of concept of numbers among various races and children” (Ludwig Kardos). On the other hand, others were oriented towards an acquisition of deeper knowledge considering a particular problem in a selected social discipline and only hinted upon future practical application: “general theoretical training in economics” (John Szell), “continuation of studies in international public law and comparative developments of Russian, Hungarian and Czechoslovak domestic laws” (Zoltan Mario Mihaly).

Additionally, there is a number of general but, nevertheless, significant aspects considering prosopographic analysis of Hungarian fellows. Firstly, background in education should be considered. In relation to acquired degrees and studied disciplines, it is important to take into account that out of 24 fellows (artists are excluded from the present analysis), 10 had a background in economics, 9 studied law and political science and law and, as have been mentioned earlier, just 3 social scientists in total were trained in psychology and history. There were two fellows (Eugene Havas and F. A. Váli) who had been trained in both, economics and political science. Furthermore, an average age of a Hungarian fellow was between 31 and 32, not to mention that all the fellows, besides Joseph Kun, who entered the program with BA in intercultural studies, had at least one doctorate.

The last pole, which key role is to show fellows’ activity after the end of the program, fulfills an important function. It enables to follow the fellows’ careers and find out how many of them pursued academic activity and in what country they decided to do it. As we shall see later, the majority of those, who found international recognition and make a significant input into development of social

science, decided to stay in the United States, away from politically unstable and turbulent Hungary. Additionally, in connection to fellows' achievement and place of residence, I am intending to display more detailed information about particular Hungarian scientists and the results of their work.

After the end of the program, as many as 15 fellows saw the United States of America and Western Europe as more attractive space for career possibilities. The reason was not only in the level of advancement that distinguished universities and research centers which were obviously lacking in number and quality in Eastern Europe (Bahro, 1980), but more in political domain characterized by instability which became the hallmark of the twentieth century. Considering the situation in Hungary, it might appear to be understandable that people, who were concerned with improvement of human conditions through scientific advancement, realized extent to which changes may occur under the military dictatorship of 1920s-1930s. Though the political situation has changed after the WWII, it did not change much for the social sciences. The shift from the White terror to the forced Communist ideology did not even remotely promise improvements, moreover, it might be argued that the position of social scientific disciplines and public intellectual activity has worsened (Kis, 1989). Further explanation should be found in ethnic contradictions that had tangible consequences for the scientists of Jewish origin. Though the archival materials do not explicitly mention obstacles that appeared in relation to the issue, yet, there is at least one evidence presented in the report on Ludwig Kardos. After returning to Hungary after a two-year period spent in Columbia University, he found himself in a difficult situation. In 1933 Kardos wrote to the Foundation's officials that he had difficulties finding a job in Hungary due to his Jewish origin. In the light of these circumstances, there is no wonder why more than a half of the fellows thought it was safer to stay in a foreign country not trapped into webs of major political complications, ideologies and dictatorships.

Additionally, I am concerned with a number of fellows who decided to pursue academic activity. According to the reports from archive of the Rockefeller Foundation, 12 fellows from the chosen period and disciplines pursued scholarly careers. Productive training received by the fellows during the program helped them to get rather influential positions in Hungarian administration (Joseph Judik received a position in Studies Division of National Bank of Hungary, Eugene Havas became a financial observer for the Hungarian Government, Laszlo Zelovich accepted a post in Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs), albeit for the sake of my inquiry it is necessary to pay closer attention to those, who continued scientific career. In relation to this, in the following chapter I am focusing on the fellows who achieved public recognition and made a distinguished impact on the development of social science with initial support, provided by the Rockefeller Foundation.

One more important issue should be taken into consideration. Even though no female Hungarian scientists acquired the fellowship during a stated period of time, one should not be misled to think that the Rockefeller's program ignored women's contribution to the advancement of the social sciences. Among first 16 fellows, who entered fellowship program in 1924, were 4 female scientists from Austria, United Kingdom and France, who aspired to work in the fields of sociology, anthropology and psychology (Fleck, 2011: 48-51). In this regard, lack of female participants from the side of Hungary should not be blamed on the Foundation's policy but should rather be viewed in a broader context of the "local" interrelationships of education and various socio-cultural aspects.

### **3.2 Selected Fellows**

In order to show how the Rockefeller Foundation's program influenced the social sciences in Hungary, it is crucial to introduce particular examples of advancement in the realm of scientific knowledge achieved by the fellows. In this chapter I am going to present accomplishments of seven selected participants of the fellowship program.

1. The first of the selected fellows is Joseph Kun. Kun, who was a 26-years-old BA from Eotvoes Lorand University in Budapest at the time when he applied to the program, was interested in Chinese Studies. His research proposal included an improvement of intercultural understanding, particularly in the sphere of Chinese-Soviet relationships. Kun's fellowship started at Yale's summer school, which he attended in order to improve his knowledge of Chinese language. After getting married and receiving MA in Far Eastern Studies, he notified the Foundation that he considered to continue his studies as a Ph.D. student and, possibly, pursue academic career after the end of the fellowship. Though it is registered that Kun was having some difficulties with English, his adjustment to the American academic system went without major hindrances. Even though, unfortunately, the information about his further achievements in education and career is lacking from the Foundation's reports, it might be assumed that his career went fairly well. Kun left a legacy of profound studies on political issues of Far East and a number of books concerning Hungarian politics and NATO. Among the most influential of them are "Communist Indochina: Problems, Policies, and Superpower Involvement" (1976), "Hungarian Foreign Policy: The Experience of a New Democracy" (1993), and "In Search of Guarantees: The Elusive NATO: is Enlargement in Sight?" (1995).

2. Another fellow is Andras Angyal, a psychologist and psychiatrist, whose record of achievements may be probably considered to be one of the most outstanding examples of success. Angyal entered the program with an impressive background of Ph.D. in psychology from University of Vienna and



M.D. from Turin, Italy. In 1932 he was directed to Yale University to study and, consequently, work in the field of sociology with psychiatric connections. In 1933 he received a position as a trainee in Worcester State Hospital. There his primary purpose was to continue a research on personality problems in schizophrenia. In 1934 he contacted the Foundation's office asking for additional funding for the research that, according to his calculations, was supposed to last for one or two more years. Angyal's request was approved. Moreover, the feedback given by medical officials of the Foundation was more than reassuring. It was written that Angyal's work required special skills and "it would be very difficult to find, in this country [in the United States], anyone who would match Dr. Angyal's qualification". Along with extensive research, Hungarian (technically Romanian) scientist was involved in theoretical development of a number of psychiatric and psychological concepts. Examples of the most famous and influential outcomes of his work are "holistic approach" and "systems theory".

Both concepts are dealing with patterns and webs of relationships between individuals and their environment. Angyal defined "the notion of biosphere as an actual realm of life which encompasses both the person and the environment, not as separate entities but as two aspects of the same reality" (Wolman, 2012).

Noteworthy, Angyal's theory of holistic approach in psychology was widely maintained by scholars of further generations. For instance, the concept is frequently mentioned by David Lester in his book "Theories of Personality: A Systematic Approach", where he also exclusively acknowledges Angyal's contribution:

*Angyal proposed a holistic theory in much greater detail than any other scholar has done. He outlined the problems and issues of a holistic perspective, and he proposed solutions to the problems (Lester, 1995).*

Angyal also published psychiatric and socio-psychological studies on various topics related to his extensive research: "The Experience of the Body-Self Schizophrenia" (1936), "The Structure of Wholes" (1941), "Foundations for a science of personality" (1941). Although he did not actively participate in research-related activity after 1945, he was engaged in a private psychiatric practice in Boston until the moment of his death in 1960.

3. The third fellow is Eugene Havas, who participated in the program as an expert in economics and political science with a diploma from Oxford. At the time when, in 1933, Havas decided to devote himself to solve the riddle of existing crisis in America, he had already maintained a reputation as

a rather well established journalistic in Hungary. He worked for daily Hungarian newspaper “Pesti Naplo” and was a correspondent for “London Economist”. Initially, Havas was supposed to spend only one year working on his project in economics in collaboration with Harvard and other prestigious American universities. Nevertheless, renewal of his fellowship was approved three more times (three periods one year each). During the last two years of the program, the focus of Havas’ research slightly shifted to the area which explored connections between financial problems and policies of state administration. In relation to this topic, Havas closely cooperated with the Ministry of Finance of the USA. Still, according to information contained in archival materials of the Foundation, the topic of his inquiry was too broad and complex and did not produce any immediate tangible results. During the time, spent in the United States, Havas reconsidered possibility of returning to journalism and, after coming back to Hungary in 1937, found a position within the Hungarian government. His further publications were commonly related to his position within the government and, in particular, associated with acts of financial character (“Hungary’s finance and trade in 1929”).

4. Bela Balassa, who was holding a doctorate in political science and law from Pazmany Peter University of Budapest, intended to use the program in order to broaden his understanding of economics, national banking and planning. When he arrived at Yale University in 1957, it was quite difficult for him to adjust to proper studying after a six-year break. In addition, it was stated that Balassa had some difficulties with English. In spite of that, the representatives of the Foundation were optimistic about the positive dynamic of his academic achievements. Balassa was working on Hungarian economic planning both at Yale and Harvard and received his second Ph.D., this time in economics, in 1959. It is also important to mention that he did not limit his studies to Hungarian economics, but expressed interest in European economic integration as well. Nowadays Balassa is probably best known for his impact on formulation of the Balassa-Samuelson effect (or the Ricardo–Viner–Harrod–Balassa–Samuelson–Penn–Bhagwati effect). This effect represents a complicated phenomenon which occurs in economy of developing countries. “The theory is based on the divergence of productivity levels in a world of traded and no traded goods, explaining that rich countries specialize in and produce goods that are characterized by higher productivity and that are easily traded internationally”<sup>7</sup>. Apart from this crucial achievement in economic theory, Balassa also published a number of articles and a book, in which he applied territorial peculiarities and economic circumstances caused by these peculiar characteristics or wider external issues: “Regional

---

<sup>7</sup> Reinert, K. A., Rajan, R. S., & Glass, A. J. (2009). The Princeton Encyclopedia of the World Economy. (Two volume set).

Integration and Trade Liberalization in Latin America” (1971), “Trade Policies in Developing Countries” (1971), “Japan in the World Economy” (Balassa, Marcus, Noland, 1988).

5. Fifth selected participant of the program is Joseph L. Balintfy. Balintfy entered the fellowship with a degree in economics from Hungarian University of Technical Sciences. Judging by his proposal for the research topic, he intended to work within the framework of industrial economics and operational techniques. Intensive training at Yale University and devotion to hard work finally made Balintfy a professor at John Hopkins University, where he spent some time during his fellowship and later, during the same year, was appointed as a consultant for the World Bank. In 1989-1990 Balintfy held a position of Chairman of the Association of Comparative Economic Studies. His most outstanding achievement is probably creation of a CAMP program (Computer Assisted Menu Planning). After his death Balintfy was called “a pioneer in computer applications”. His theoretical accomplishment is connected with the formulation of “the concept of time preference”. The concept became an outcome of Balintfy’s investigation of changing food preferences and possible reasons standing behind them. One of the underlining assumptions of the concept of time preference is the frequency with which an individual consumes a particular product or food. Balintfy, however, argued that more issues should be taken into account and frequency by itself is insufficient for creating and applying a theory of consumption and preferences. This acknowledgment of multiple causation became his major contribution to the theory (Moskowitz, 2000).

6. Stephen Kertesz, trained in law and international relations, was mainly interested in an affair of international responsibility of the United States. At the beginning of his fellowship, Kertesz was planning on returning to Hungary and pursuing academic career by teaching law at University of Budapest. During 1936, he spent the majority of time doing a research on international relations at Harvard, Chicago and Yale University. In order to expand his understanding of politics and see alternatives to American perspective, Kertesz’s fellowship was extended for nine more months, which he spent in London, Geneva and Vienna. Even after the end of the fellowship period, the Rockefeller Foundation occasionally assisted Kertesz by making financial contributions that were sufficient enough to ensure proceeding of the research. In 1947 he was offered Foreign Ministership within the newly established Communist Hungary. There is no precise information on whether Kertesz did not accept the offer due to political inclinations or other circumstances. However, there is an evidence in the Foundation’s archival materials which proves Kertesz’s wish to stay in Western Europe or the USA. He pursued his academic carrier at Yale Law School and the University of Notre Dame, where he occupied a position of research assistant and a professor of political science

respectively. While teaching, Kertesz also published some articles within the period of 1948-1950: “Minority Population Exchange; Czechoslovakia and Hungary”, “The Plight of Satellite Democracy”, “Human Rights in Peace Treaties”, “Methods of Soviet Penetration in Eastern Europe”. According to the Foundation’s reports and Kertesz himself, these articles and a book, which came later, were considered to be an outcome of his extensive training in international relations received during the fellowship. “Diplomacy in a Whirlpool”, published in 1955, was highly evaluated not only by scholars, but also by diplomats. Later the same year, Kertesz was appointed Chairman of the Committee of International Relations.

7. The last but, definitely, not the least important fellow is Edward Theiss. He received his title of Doctor of economics in 1931 from Polytechnic Institute in Budapest. Theiss’ plans for research within the fellowship were ambitious. Suggested research topic was a study of business cycles, statistical research methods, dynamical economic phenomena in relation to business fluctuations and process of averaging time of investment of capital. Although the scientist spent a fair amount of time in Columbia and Harvard, the Foundation also approved Theiss’ request to visit Scandinavian countries, where he spent two months in 1933. He undertook the second trip the following year, visiting the prestigious universities of Copenhagen, Stockholm and Oslo and spending some time in London School of Economics. Right after the end of the program, Theiss published articles in two influential economic journals: “Time and capitalistic production” (1932) and “A Quantitative Theory of Industrial Fluctuations Caused by the Capitalistic Technique of Production” (1933) in the *Journal of Political Economy* and “Dynamics of saving and investment” (1935) in *Econometrica*. After returning to Hungary, Theiss became a Docent at the Economic faculty of Franz Joseph University in Szeged. His academic interest encompassed quantitative economics, statistics and analysis of Supply and Demand Curves. Officials’ reports suggest that by the 1946, Theiss had a successful academic career in Budapest; in 1943 he published a book on *Business Cycle Research* (the majority of data was gained during the period of the fellowship), which received a prize from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which offered Theiss a membership in 1945.

### **3.3 Analysis of the Foundation's Impact**

As any phenomenon that does not lack controversy, the Foundation’s activity represents a fertile ground for debate. Its support for social science is not an exception. Earlier I have emphasized the role of the two major opponents on the issue. While Martin Bulmer repeatedly points out an outstanding role of the Foundation and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in particular in the

development of the social sciences through both individual fellowships and “block” grants for universities and institutions, Donald Fisher depicts the philanthropic organization as a capitalist mechanism which is not at all devoid of its specific interests, “forcing its ideas upon academics” (Fisher, 1980: 290). Notwithstanding, there is an opinion suggesting that “while Fisher and Bulmer both offer interesting insights into the development of social science...neither author has been able to offer a totally convincing account of the foundation’s political, social and intellectual role in society” (Ahmad, 1991:517). Similarly, in case of Hungarian fellows, there are positive arguments proving the Foundation’s policy and support to be advantageous and, on the other hand, there are aspects that might strengthen an opinion which highlights its weaknesses and lack of virtual advancement of scientific knowledge.

On the one hand, it may be claimed that the Rockefeller Foundation created auspicious conditions for Hungarian social scientists. Providing an opportunity to spend some time solely on a chosen topic of inquiry in the leading centers for social research (Bulmer, 1982) and releasing fellows from the significant financial burdens, the Foundation introduced a great opportunity for a number of selected young scientists (Fleck, 2011). Interestingly enough, in personal cards of the fellows other covered expenses besides strictly research related needs and accommodation are mentioned. Notes like “special clothing allowance of 200\$ or 250\$” or those related to family needs of the fellows are rather frequent. These notes may advocate a holistic approach maintained by the Foundation’s officials towards the fellows, among whom, firstly, the majority had just received a degree and had not yet had an opportunity to become fully financially stable and, secondly, some were having various problems due to a complicated political situation. In terms of political complications, Hungarian scientists of Jewish origin were probably in the most difficult position. In this regard, the program introduced not only horizons of intellectual freedom but a possibility to safely immigrate to other countries. It has been pointed out that, after Hitler’s rise to power, the United States became an ultimate destination for Jewish émigrés (Frank, 2008).

Furthermore, the projects, started by the scientists during the fellowship, oftentimes became the beginning of profound studies, books, and even theories that are still valid nowadays (for example, Balassa-Samuelson effect and Angyal’s holistic approach to personality). In relation to this, it is significant to mention that the Foundation usually stayed in touch with former fellows and was still eager to provide support for scientific research. For instance, in 1963, after almost six years after the termination of his fellowship program, F. A. Váli had requested a grant of \$7,291 and the Foundation approved it. The grant went to the University of Massachusetts to enable Váli to study

“complexities of the interrelationship between German nationalism and the Cold War problem of German partition”.

Fellowships, organized by American philanthropic organizations, which created an opportunity for European scientists to spend some time abroad, generally led to exchange of ideas and, consequently, to “enrichment” of empirical social research (Fleck, 2011). Although this claim is difficult to disprove, it should be taken into account that philanthropic bodies, including the Rockefeller Foundation, were mainly interested in promotion of research methods for the social sciences in “those European nations that used to be regarded as scientific leaders” (Fleck, 2011: 2). For instance, between 1929 and 1941, the philanthropic organization selected 17 Austrian and 53 German scientists to participate in the program. On the contrary, only 24 social scientists and 2 artists became fellows between 1926 and 1958.

Taking into consideration turbulent history of Hungary which was not marked by democratic improvement in politics, nor by liberalization in social sector, the country had virtually no chances of joining the leaders of scientific research. Moreover, in Hungary the Foundation initially supported three major projects. These projects were connected to medical research and social sciences. It is difficult to mention actual reasons which became the main hindrances when it came to social science, but, according to the presented analysis, “the Foundation’s support given to the social sciences in Hungary was almost negligible” because of “cultural and science policies” pursued by the government (Gemelli, MacLeod, 2003). Following this evidence, it might be assumed that an impact on the improvement of hygiene and medical conditions in Eastern Europe, and in Hungary in particular, played more profound role in comparison to social science.

## Conclusion

*The social sciences came to maturity - or at least left their adolescence - at a singularly inhospitable time in history. Two cataclysmic world wars, with an equally cataclysmic depression sandwiched in between, and a future that is black with uncertainty, have swamped these freshly arrived sciences and techniques in a flood of newly created and insistent problems. It is as if, in the medical sciences, the doctors were struggling with a constant stream of new diseases for which there was no time for diagnosis and research (Fosdick, 1952: 210).*

The quote from Fosdick's "The story of the Rockefeller Foundation" perfectly portrays the first half of the twentieth century along with complicated position of the social sciences. Enough has been mentioned in relation to hardships faced by social scientists of the time and attempts undertaken by the Foundation in order to relieve them. Nevertheless, it is still difficult to clearly identify an impact made by the philanthropic body. Even in endeavor to find an answer for a question whether the Foundation's impact was negative or beneficial, one would be perplexed by the range of contradictory data. Quite understandably, motives and activity of philanthropic and charitable organizations represent a debatable issue. Consequently, in my thesis I focused on factual materials and used strongly pronounced opinions in regard to the Rockefeller Foundation in order to introduce multiple perspectives on the issue.

The factual materials I addressed are index cards, retrieved from the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), which include personal information and scientific inclinations of the Hungarian fellows. Linking this information to political situation in Hungary between 1920s and 1950s, I attempted to expose a visible prosopographic pattern. By analyzing this pattern, I aspired to depict the Foundation's support under particular scientific tendencies and social and political circumstances of the mentioned period of time.

As have been mentioned earlier, one should be extremely careful with evaluation of such issues. I have acquainted with various perspectives and became aware of both, possible disadvantages of the Foundation's policy and the fellowship program and, on the other hand, evidence that would justify its beneficial role in scientific advancement. Moreover, systematization and analysis of the archival data equipped me with a particular example of the program's functioning and, consequently, with an ability to reach more unambiguous conclusion considering the Foundation's activity. In this regard, I am convinced in its intention to promote "the wellbeing of mankind throughout the world". Furthermore, in my opinion, the Foundation contributed to the development of the social sciences and truly supported Hungarian social scientists in many respects. Putting it differently, apart from

an opportunity to attain the best universities of the time and dedicate themselves to chosen topics of research, Hungarian fellows received long-lasting support which was especially significant under the conditions of its “local” and worldwide changes during the first half of the twentieth century.



## List of References

- Ahmad, S. (1991). American Foundations and the Development of the Social Sciences between the Wars: Comment on the Debate between Martin Bulmer and Donald Fisher. *Sociology*, 511-520.
- Bahro, R. (1980). *The Alternative in Eastern Europe*. Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford University Press, 1-20.
- Bremner, R. H. (1988). *American philanthropy (Vol. 2)*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Bulmer, M. (1982). Support for Sociology in the 1920s: The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Beginnings of Modern, Large-Scale, Sociological Research in the University. *The American Sociologist*, 185-192.
- Bulmer, M. (1984). Philanthropic foundations and the development of the social sciences in the early twentieth century: a reply to Donald Fisher. *Sociology*, 572-579.
- Bulmer, M. (1993). *Ventures in Patronage* [online]. Available from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2882344> [Accessed 15 March 2016].
- Bulmer, M., & Bulmer, J. (1981). Philanthropy and social science in the 1920s: Beardsley Ruml and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1922–29. *Minerva*, 19(3), 347-407.
- Buxton, W. J. (2003). John Marshall and the humanities in Europe: Shifting patterns of Rockefeller Foundation support. *Minerva*, 41(2), 133-153.
- Craver, E. (1986). Patronage and the directions of research in economics: the Rockefeller Foundation in Europe, 1924–1938. *Minerva*, 24(2), 205-222.
- Engerman, D. C. (1999). New Society, New Scholarship: Soviet Studies Programmes in Interwar America. *Minerva*, 37(1), 25-43.
- Fisher, D. (1978). The Rockefeller Foundation and the development of scientific medicine in Great Britain. *Minerva*, 16(1), 20-41.
- Fisher, D. (1980). American Philanthropy and the Social Sciences in Britain, 1919–1939; the reproduction of a Conservative Ideology. *The Sociological Review*, 28(2), 277-315.

- Fisher, D. (1983). The role of philanthropic foundations in the reproduction and production of hegemony: Rockefeller foundations and the social sciences. *Sociology*, 17(2), 206-233.
- Fleck, C. (2011). *A transatlantic history of the social sciences: Robber barons, the Third Reich and the invention of empirical social research*. Bloomsbury.
- Fosdick, R. B. (1952). *The story of the Rockefeller Foundation*. Harper & Brothers.
- Frank, T. (2008). *Double exile: migrations of Jewish-Hungarian professionals through Germany to the United States, 1919-1945* (Vol. 7). Peter Lang.
- Geiger, R. L. (1993). *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Gemelli, G., & MacLeod, R. M. (Eds.). (2003). *American Foundations in Europe: Grant-giving Policies, Cultural Diplomacy, and Trans-Atlantic Relations, 1920-1980*.
- Harna, J. (1993). *První Československá republika-pokus o demokracii ve střední Evropě*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Hassard, J. (1995). *Sociology and organization theory: Positivism, paradigms and postmodernity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ish-Shalom, P. (2006). Theory as a hermeneutical mechanism: The democratic-peace thesis and the politics of democratization. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(4), 565-598.
- Karl, B. D. (1985). Philanthropy and the Social Sciences. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 129(1), 14-19.
- Keats-Rohan, K. S. (2007). *Prosopography approaches and applications: A Handbook*. The University of Oxford.
- Kis, J. (1989). Turning Point in Hungary: A Voice from the Democratic Opposition. *Dissent* (Spring 1989).
- Kohler, R. E. (1976). The management of science: The experience of Warren Weaver and the Rockefeller Foundation programme in molecular biology. *Minerva*, 14(3), 279-306.
- Kolakowski, L. (1968). *Towards a marxist humanism: Essays on the left today*. Grove Press.

- Lenin, V. I., & Chretien, T. (2015). *State and revolution*. Haymaker Books.
- Lester, D. (1995). *Theories of personality: A systems approach*. Taylor & Francis.
- Moskowitz, H. R. (2000). Engineering out food boredom: a product development approach that combines home use tests and time-preference analysis. *Food Quality and Preference*.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment.
- Olivová, V. (2000). *Dějiny první republiky*. Karolinum.
- Page, B. B. (2001). First Steps: The Rockefeller Foundation in Early Czechoslovakia. *East European Quarterly*, 35(3).
- Parmar, I., & Rietzler, K. (2014). American Philanthropy and the Hard, Smart and Soft Power of the United States. *Global Society*, 28(1), 3-7.
- Péteri, G. (1998). *Academia and State Socialism: essays on the political history of academic life in post-1945 Hungary and Eastern Europe*. Social science monographs.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Reinert, K. A., Rajan, R. S., & Glass, A. J. (2009). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of the World Economy. (Two volume set)*. Princeton University Press, 111-114.
- Reisch, G. A. (2005). How the Cold War transformed philosophy of science: To the icy slopes of logic.
- Roman, E. (1999). *The Stalin Years in Hungary (Vol. 2)*. Edwin Mellen Pr.
- Ross, D. (1992). *The origins of American social science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. The Free Press.
- Solomon, S. G. (2008). Circulation of knowledge and the Russian locale. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 9(1), 9-26.
- Stone, L. (1971). Prosopography. *Daedalus*, 46-79.

Weber, M. (1949). Objectivity in social science and social policy. *The methodology of the social sciences*, 78, 10-112.

Wolman, B. B. (2012). *Contemporary theories and systems in psychology (Vol. 2)*. Plenum Press.

Алле, М., & Егоров, И. А. (1995). Экономика как наука. *Современная экономическая мысль*.

Курбатов, В. И. (2001). Современная западная социология. *Учеб. пособие Ростов н/Д: Феникс*.

Лыгина, М. А. (2008). Филантропия как социокультурный феномен. *Известия Пензенского государственного педагогического университета им. ВГ Белинского*, (13).

Репина, Л. П. (1998). Новая историческая наука» и социальная история.

Филимонов, Г. Ю. (2013). Роль «мягкой силы» во внешней политике США.

Хикса, Д. Р. (2003). Теория экономической истории. *еще одно подтверждение того, что сотрудничество историков и экономистов в изучении развития экономики может быть весьма плодотворным*.

Юнгблюд, В. Т. (2006). Вклад неправительственных исследовательских организаций США в изучение международных отношений (1933-1941 гг.). *Вестник Вятского государственного гуманитарного университета*, (14).

### **Archival Materials**

Rockefeller Foundation records, fellowships, RG 10 (FA426), Subgroup 2: Fellowship recorder cards, Discipline 5: Humanities Fellows – Hungary. Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Sleepy Hollow, Tarrytown, New York.

## **Websites**

<https://www.carnegie.org/about/our-history/past-programs-initiatives/> [Accessed 2 April 2016].

<http://www.fordfoundation.org/about-us/history/> [Accessed 15 May 2016].

<https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/about-us/our-history/> [Accessed 2 April 2016].

<http://www.russellsage.org/> [Accessed 2 April 2016].

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/europe/hu-history-21.htm> [Accessed 29 May 2016]