

ON LUIGI EINAUDI'S ADVISORY COLLABORATION
WITH THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION
(1926-1931)

ALESSIA PEDIO*

Luigi Einaudi's collaboration in the years 1926-1931, first as a representative then as an advisor for Italy, to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM) and the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) is a little-known episode of his multifaceted career. In his role as "cultural entrepreneur" he was charged with selecting young Italian social scientists for the American organization's fellowship program, to finance their studies either in the United States or in Europe. In this rather arduous undertaking he demonstrated not only diplomacy in his relationships with the program officers, but also his desire to make a successful contribution, without compromising his point of view about some crucial aspects of the RF agenda.

The collaboration between Einaudi and LSRM took place during a difficult transition period from the RF organization's pioneering pattern, in which various and wasteful philanthropic actions concerning public health and medical education were planned day by day, to a new era of centralization of the financial resources. In 1928, under George E. Vincent's presidency, a new plan was launched;¹ this reorganized the RF structure into five core divisions: international health, medical sciences, natural sciences, humanities and social sciences. In 1929, many of the LSRM's programs were incorporated into the Division of Social Sciences, and the Social Science Research Council, founded in 1923, became more strategic in promoting the interdisciplinary integration of any research activities.

From 1922 until the end of 1928 the LSRM really evolved under the guidance of the psychologist and statistician Beardsley Rumml, who is still considered the founder of the American social sciences, for his help in sta-

* Università di Torino. Address for correspondence: alessia.pedio@libero.it.

¹ This reorganization was the idea of Raymond Fosdick who, at that time, was a trustee of the RF; he became RF president in 1936.

bilizing and institutionalizing the discipline. This field developed within the agency, created in 1917 in memory of John D. Rockefeller's wife, with the purpose of analyzing the reasons behind social disorders and to suggest welfare solutions. To reduce the gap with natural and medical sciences, the objectives and methods of the social sciences were clarified under Ruml's direction: they were based on an experimental approach, rationalization of departments and laboratories, intellectual cooperation and scientific specialization.

These standards represented a crucial concern of "cultural capitalism" and "philanthropic universalism",² which in the interest of pursuing the "wellness of mankind", led to the practice of funding universities, public and private institutions, individuals or groups in the United States and abroad.

In 1924, thanks to Ruml's initiative, a structured program of one- or two-year fellowships was started for promising European scholars to conduct research in the social sciences, preferably in American universities, provided that they returned to their country of origin. After a tour in Europe, the RF officers chose two representatives for Great Britain and France – the historian James Ramsay Montagu Butler and the political economist Charles Rist. Over the next three years the program was extended to Australia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden and other scientists were appointed for each nation.³

This policy of "cross-fertilization", grounded on the modernization of knowledge skills through the international or trans-national exchange of people and ideas, had the twofold advantage of (i) exporting American models and (ii) participating in the administrative and political education of European elites.⁴

In the years of the Cold War, the Rockefeller and other foundations supported the project of constructing an "Atlantic community", which shared similar values against the Communist threat and preferred to give an impression of independence to European intellectual elites, rather than to resort exclusively to military power. Although asymmetrical, these relationships nevertheless forced American statesmen to confront national European trends, resulting in an unremitting pursuit of equilibrium and reciprocal agreements, capable of modifying both actors' behaviors.⁵ In a

² See: TOURNÈS (2007).

³ *Representatives of the Memorial*, New York, April 1st, 1927, Archivio della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi, Turin, hereinafter: TFE, *Documents. 3 Bio*, 1927, f. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

⁴ On the "cross-fertilization" and trans-national RF policy consequences see: GEMELLI (2005) and ATTAL (2010).

⁵ See: KRIGE (2006), KRIGE and RAUSCH (2012).

diachronic view, the decisions taken during the 1920s, according to some strategic plans, played a significant role in the postwar Western Europe distribution of knowledge, and the RF itself had a long-term philanthropic aim which continued into the 1950s and mid-1960s. Besides the trans-national contribution, another aspect of RF decision-making was its so-called trans-generational effect. In most cases, the former fellows awarded the RF grants had outstanding careers and after the Second World War benefited from RF funds to finance academic institutes.

Returning to Italy, which since 1922 had been under Mussolini's government, sociological studies were dominated by the elitist political theories of Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto and Roberto Michels, but since the last quarter of the nineteenth century an environment of innovation had been consolidated around the Laboratory of Political Economy (*Laboratorio di Economia Politica*), founded in Turin by Salvatore Cognetti de Martiis. There, scholars like Luigi Einaudi and Gioele Solari learned to examine economic problems using a multidisciplinary, sociological, political and historical approach.⁶ In order to foster international exchanges, in 1923 the philosopher and Minister of Education Giovanni Gentile established the Italian Inter-university Institute (*Istituto italiano interuniversitario*), which sought to promote academic policies under government control, but with little success.⁷

In a scenario where there was relative interest in the American way of life, and where the efforts to overcome Italian cultural backwardness were still embryonic, the RF's fellowship program was welcomed as the only worthwhile alternative. Moreover, the RF guidelines offered a means with which to define disciplinary boundaries:

To date, fellowship appointments in the social sciences have been made in the following fields: Economics, Political Science, Sociology (including Criminology), Psychology and Psychiatry, Anthropology (cultural as contrasted with physical), Geography (human and economic as contrasted with physical), Statistics, History (in its political, economic and social phases), Law, Public and Business Administration, Social Welfare Administration.⁸

Luigi Einaudi's name was probably suggested to the RF staff by Charles Rist; Einaudi's non-dogmatic and interdisciplinary contribution to the Lab-

⁶ See: BECCHIO and MARCHIONATTI (2005).

⁷ See: MARIUZZO (2011).

⁸ *Copy of a letter from E.E. Day. The Rockefeller Foundation Inter-office correspondence, April 2nd 1929. Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York, hereinafter: RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES, box 49, folder 375.*

oratory of Political Economy, as well as his affinities with Anglophone economics scholarship, earned as an Italian correspondent for *The Economist* and *Manchester Guardian*, made his scientific profile highly appreciated in the international academic community. Besides being a reference figure for foreign fellows in Italy, during his six-years cooperation with the LSRM and RF, Einaudi selected twenty Italian scholars: 13 economists (in 1927: Luigi De Simone, Attilio Da Empoli, Angelo Martinenghi, Pietro Rota-Sperti; in 1928: Ezio Vanoni; in 1929: Alberto Breglia, Renzo Fubini, Francesco Vito; in 1930: Giovanni De Maria; in 1931: Mario De Bernardi, Vincenzo Moretti, Carlo Pagni, Volrico Travaglini), four political scientists or jurists (in 1926: Alessandro Passerin D'Entrèves, in 1927: Mario Einaudi; in 1929; Antonello Gerbi; in 1931: Max Ascoli), a natural scientist, expert in social psychology (in 1927: Alessandro Gatti), one anthropologist (in 1931: Renato Boccassino) and a sociologist (in 1932: Leo Ferrero). Four of them – Martinenghi, Fubini, De Maria, and De Bernardi – belonged directly to Einaudi's "school" or worked as editors of the review *La Riforma Sociale* (Fubini, De Bernardi); Mario Einaudi and Passerin d'Entrèves graduated under Gioele Solari's guidance.

In July 1925, William E. Lingelbach, Modern History professor at the University of Pennsylvania, was deployed to Europe on Ruml's behalf. After visiting the Laboratory of Political Economy and the Juridical Institute (Istituto Giuridico) of Turin, he personally met Luigi Einaudi, who introduced him to Professor and Senator Francesco Ruffini.⁹ In October Lingelbach transmitted an official invitation to Einaudi "to represent the Memorial in the nomination of Italian candidates for travelling fellowships in the Social Sciences and matters appertaining thereto".¹⁰ At the end of the year, he received Ruml's enthusiastic congratulations for having secured Einaudi's and Johan Huizinga's collaboration with LSRM, which began on 1 January 1926.¹¹ During the summer Lingelbach had been also in Florence, where he interviewed Giuseppe Prezzolini, who recommended some names and provided useful information regarding the choice of advisors.¹² Since the program was in an experimental phase, the representatives were invited to make suggestions and to visit the United States for a tour of the main academic institutions with the purpose of giving them "a chance to see some of the work which is being done in the social

⁹ Letter from William E. Lingelbach to L. Einaudi, Rome, July 7th 1925. TFE, *Correspondence*, 2, f. William E. Lingelbach.

¹⁰ Letter from William E. Lingelbach to L. Einaudi, Paris, October 26th 1925. *Ibid.*

¹¹ Letter from William E. Lingelbach to L. Einaudi, Paris, December 29th 1925. *Ibid.*

¹² See: M. DARDI, *Alberto Bertolino attraverso il fascismo*, in BARUCCI, BINI and CONIGLIELLO (2017):12.

sciences".¹³ In June 1926, Einaudi and Huizinga went together on a road trip for two months and the RF comptroller at Ruml's office, Frank Bernard Stubbs, took care of all the bureaucratic and practical details of their stay in the United States.¹⁴

During the spring of 1926, Einaudi was busy informing his colleagues in Milan, Pavia, Genoa, Florence, and Naples about the program, and in June the LSRM approved his first proposal with regard to the political scientist Passerin d'Entrèves, who would go to Cambridge to study «XVI Century and Modern English political theory» (particularly Hooker's philosophy of law) under Butler's supervision. In the fall of the same year, Einaudi began questioning some aspects of the LSRM policy, particularly in an effort to avoid problems with married candidates, who were reluctant to leave Italy and generally asked for an extra financial support from the RF.

Having appreciated Attilio Da Empoli's two recent books, *Teoria dell'incidenza delle imposte* (Reggio Calabria, 1926) and *Riflessioni sull'equilibrio economico* (Reggio Calabria, 1926), in his first letter to the 22-year-old scholar, he suggested that he not marry too early (as was usual in Southern Italy at that time) and observed about himself that "if I had the possibility of a fellowship abroad after my degree, I would have accepted it, walking on my knees".¹⁵

Encouraged by Einaudi, Da Empoli presented his candidature for an inquiry on "Incidence of taxation and economic equilibrium", but he was called up for military service and had to postpone his sailing departure until two years later, in 1929.¹⁶

After reading the *Bulletin of Information* and a memorandum with the guidelines for the LSRM grants and fellowships in the United States and other countries,¹⁷ Einaudi was worried about finding suitable Italian candidates, who preferred research instead of teaching as assistant professors in

¹³ Letter from B. Ruml to L. Einaudi, [New York,] January 19th, 1926. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Beardsley Ruml.

¹⁴ See: F. B. Stubbs-L. Einaudi's correspondence in February-June 1926. *Ibid.*, f. Frank Bernard Stubbs.

¹⁵ Letter from L. Einaudi to A. Da Empoli, Turin, December 29th 1926. FIRPO (1969): 387.

¹⁶ RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Da Empoli Attilio; TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Attilio Da Empoli.

¹⁷ According to the LSRM policy the fellows had a monthly stipend of \$1800, that which included tuition (only for US universities) and travel fees (6-7 cents a mile for long long-distance travel distance). The fellowships started on September 1st and during the summer it was possible to travel across to the United States. *Bulletin of information Information for recipients Recipients of fellowships Fellowships awarded Awarded by The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial*, TFE, *Documents*. 3 Bio, 1926, f. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial.

Italian universities. Nevertheless, Ruml was confident about the future of the plan for Italy,¹⁸ and reiterated the basic principle of the LSRM, namely to raise the bar.

A few months later, Einaudi was able to propose six fellows for the year 1927;¹⁹ in addition to one married man, Alessandro Gatti, the group included his son, Mario Einaudi, with a project on “Judicial control of constitutionality of laws in US”.²⁰ Einaudi asked for advice about putting forth his son’s name, but Lingelbach did not find any “impropriety whatsoever”;²¹ moreover this candidature came with Gioele Solari’s endorsement. As for the number of scholars per year, Lawrence K. Frank, another social scientist who worked as a trustee in Ruml’s staff, invited Einaudi to look for an equitable distribution of 3-4 people directed to the United States and 2-3 to other countries; he also stressed the importance of avoiding initiatives outside the interests of LSRM in the social sciences.²²

Near the departure of the first group, the officers provided details about the restrictive measures of the United States Immigration Act (1924), which exceptionally granted “non-quota immigrant” visas to the fellows of accredited institutions like the LSRM. However, they suggested some rules of conduct to keep the scholars out of political controversies about Italy, in case of journalistic interviews.²³ Whereas Einaudi may have appreciated these observations, over the years some Italian fellows quite resented several officers’ attitudes, as reported in a letter from Renzo Fubini’s:

I don’t mind telling you that among all *fellows* there is a little bit animosity about Sharp, who feels like he must watch over their behaviors sometimes in a rough way, like an headmaster towards his pupils.²⁴

In February 1928 Einaudi took part in the Paris meeting of European representatives of the LSRM, organized in order to analyze some crucial points of the fellowship program, like the acceptance of married fellows

¹⁸ *Letter from B. Ruml to L. Einaudi*, [New York,] November 30th, 1926. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Beardsley Ruml.

¹⁹ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to B. Ruml*, Turin, May 10th 1927. *Ibid.*

²⁰ RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Einaudi Mario.

²¹ *Letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi*, [New York,] May 27th 1927. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Lawrence K. Frank. *Letter from William E. Lingelbach to L. Einaudi*, [Philadelphia,] June 21st 1927. *Ibid.*, f. William E. Lingelbach.

²² Einaudi interested in a proposal of the Secretary of the Board of Education for Librarianship in Chicago. *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to L. K. Frank*, Turin, June 18th 1927. *Ibid.*, f. Lawrence K. Frank.

²³ *Letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi*, [New York,] May 27th 1927. *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Letter from R. Fubini to L. Einaudi*, Cambridge, Mass., 15th June [1930]. BECCHIO (2004): 33. Walter R. Sharp was fellowship secretary of the Social Science Research Council.

and the introduction of a rule discouraging their salary increase request, but the opinions were very clashed and any decisions were deferred. For his part Einaudi would have liked to open the plan to other Mediterranean countries, for example Spain,²⁵ but although Ruml agreed, during the 1920s and 1930s no program was launched in that country.²⁶

In January 1929 the LSRM was folded into the RF without no particular changes and upon Ruml's resignation,²⁷ the economist Edmund E. Day was appointed the first director of the Division of the Social Sciences, under whose management the investments in developing the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Social Science Research Council were increased. Two officers with excellent experience in European political affairs joined Day's staff at the European Office in Paris: in 1929 as assistant director, John Van Sickle, the liberal economist, very sympathetic to Luigi Einaudi (in opposition to Keynes's planning theory), who in 1919-1920 worked at the American embassy in Paris and until 1922 was a technical consultant to the Austrian government; later, Tracy B. Kittredge, who had been coordinator in 1914 for France with the Commission for Relief in Belgium and general secretary for eight years of the International Federation of the Red Cross.

Hired in 1927 by the LSRM, Day had already been in touch with Einaudi to discuss a number of policy aspects related to: the salary suspension in the case of the fellows who took a leave of absence from their place of study, the tuition payments to American universities, the limitation of the extensions to a third year, and finally irregular appointments in countries where the Memorial did not have representatives.²⁸ With regard to the "extension" argument, there was a mandatory rule in place that it could be allowed under "very exceptional cases", such that only Passerin d'Entrèves and his Austrian colleague Oskar Morgenstern benefited from a three-year fellowship. Nevertheless, four other Italian fellows from the first cycle — De Simone, Gatti, Martinenghi, Rosa-Sperti — and Mario Einaudi, too, expressed the same intention. Discouraging this trend, Day asked if it was advisable to include some additional wording on the application form

at the end of the Personal History Record, just above the signature, a statement of intention on the part of the Fellow to return to his country after finishing his fellowship to take an active part in the development of his subject in his country.²⁹

²⁵ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to B. Ruml, Turin, February 14th 1928. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Beardsley Ruml.

²⁶ Letter from B. Ruml to L. Einaudi, [New York,] February 29th 1928. *Ibid.*

²⁷ Letter from B. Ruml to L. Einaudi, [New York,] December 21st 1928. *Ibid.*

²⁸ Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] May 9th 1928. *Ibid.*, f. Edmund E. Day.

²⁹ Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] November 20th 1928. *Ibid.*

Although Einaudi did not condone inappropriate attempts to circumvent the RF policy and found this solution to be suitable, he observed that

It must may be that new circumstances can change, after return, the outlook of the life of past fellows, so that they deem it advisable to live in the U. S., as well as in other countries different from the country of origin.³⁰

Among the “new circumstances” there was the expansion of the Fascist dictatorship, which was perceived as intolerable with its strong restrictions on civil liberties, as in the case of Rota-Sperti who visited Day’s office to inform him that “for political reasons he would not be allowed to re-enter Italy at the expiration of his fellowship”.³¹

Since Rota-Sperti had already revealed his intention to look for employment in the United States a year before, Einaudi tried to remind him of the importance of devoting himself to theoretical training, in order to publish the results of his research on «American investment trusts and financial problems». ³² When Einaudi learned about Rota-Sperti’s request for a third year, he was quite disappointed, because the RF might start to call into question the seriousness of the Italian scholars.³³ The moral commitment they made to return to the country of origin at the expiration of the fellowship would become relevant, especially in view of the restrictions of the new regulations, which had entered into force. Consequently Einaudi suggested that the fellow return to Italy to transmit his knowledge or find an Italian Credit Institute with an American branch, where he could be hired. Instead, after two years as a financial analyst at the Investment Trust of Montreal and one year as a temporary assistant at the International Labour Office in Geneva, in 1932 Rota-Sperti obtained a business position in Brazil.³⁴

Still on theme of extending the RF fellowships in order to remain abroad, Luigi De Simone’s events were more unlucky and troubled. In 1921 he graduated with a law degree in Naples, when he approached antifascist Edoardo Persico’s circle and liberal Piero Gobetti’s milieu. When he arrived in the United States in 1928, planning to study the «Influence of ‘time factor’ in economic analysis, as demonstrated in the cotton trade»,

³⁰ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to E. E. Day, Turin, December 4th 1928. *Ibid.*

³¹ Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] March 28th 1929. *Ibid.*, f. Rockefeller (The Foundation. New York.

³² Copy letter from L. Einaudi to P. Rota-Sperti, Turin, April 16th 1928. *Ibid.*, f. Pietro Rota-Sperti.

³³ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to P. Rota-Sperti, Turin, April 25th April 1929. *Ibid.*

³⁴ RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Rota-Sperti Pietro.

he wrote nostalgic first impressions about the Italian way of life compared to the material and consumeristic American society, but Einaudi invited him to open his mind to new experiences.³⁵ Two years later, De Simone decided to ask for a fellowship renewal for a third year, but Einaudi could not confirm anything of his research activity, because he had not received his annual report. The Foundation declined his request in accordance with its regulations and in order “to appoint a larger number of Fellows rather than to extend the period of the appointment for a smaller number”.³⁶

De Simone did not seem to have understood the point, and in September 1929 Day clarified a second time the reasons for the decline, but in view of a possible misunderstanding, the RF would give him a three-month “extension” to facilitate his return to Italy.³⁷ Faced with this situation, Einaudi commented in a handwritten note (maybe not sent to Day) that in Italy, there

do not exist intermediate positions between doctorship and lectureship (private-docentship brings no money income) and/or assistants such as instructors are in our fields very rare indeed. Young men are bound to know this situation and to face it. The Rockefeller fellowships are a splendid opportunity towards bridging the gap; but fellows must be aware of the fact that at the end of the one- or two-years fellowship, academic positions cannot be in sight for them, as it never was in past times for their predecessors.³⁸

As stated by Daniela Parisi, De Simone used the prolongation of the fellowship to go to Berlin, where he stayed one year as an assistant instructor and researcher at the Institute of Finance and Commerce, but, unemployed again in 1931, he asked the RF officers for an economic help, reminding them of his antifascist stance.³⁹

Another complex situation concerned Alessandro Gatti, who during the fellowship not only had a family allowance that, after his stay in Germany, permitted his wife and daughter to join him in the United States, but also assumed as a fact his renewal for a third year. As in De Simone's case, Gatti's request disappointed Luigi Einaudi, because the fellow failed to satisfy the conditions of “exceptionality” laid down in the RF regulations

³⁵ Letter from L. De Simone to L. Einaudi, Cambridge, Mass., March 14th 1928. Copy letter of L. Einaudi to L. De Simone, Turin, April 16th April 1928. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Luigi De Simone.

³⁶ Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] May 24th 1929. *Ibid.*, f. Rockefeller (The) Foundation. New York.

³⁷ Wire from Rockefeller Foundation to L. Einaudi, [September 11th 1929]. *Ibid.* Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] September 20th 1929. *Ibid.*, f. Edmund E. Day. Handwritten letter from L. Einaudi to E. E. Day, October 16th 1929. *Ibid.*

³⁸ Handwritten letter from L. Einaudi to E. E. Day, post October 16th 1929. *Ibid.*

³⁹ PARISI (2007): 422-424.

(“excellent professors’ references on his report and good research results during the two-year fellowship”) and he interpreted the refusal as a negative evaluation of his work. But the excellent academic references, which he said to have presented to prove his merits, came within the normal accomplishments of the fellowship, and the RF staff did not consider them sufficient to grant him any more.⁴⁰

The controversy between Day and Gatti was animated. While the program officers generally demonstrated generosity to the fellows who experienced financial difficulties through various extra actions (taken before a policy was codified), Einaudi feared that an Italian scholar’s bad reputation could lead to their exclusion from future plans, so he replied vigorously to Gatti. Even after his explanations the fellow still considered himself to be correct, but preferred to close the discussion, writing to Day that his objections were expressed without any direct responsibility or involvement of Einaudi.⁴¹

Less problematic were Mario Einaudi’s and Angelo Martinenghi’s requests for renewal, because they accepted without questioning the RF decisions. The former returned to Italy and after obtaining his lectureship in History of Political Doctrine at the University of Messina, in 1933 moved with his wife, Manon Michels, to the United States, because he refused to take the fascist oath, required of all Italian professors. Thanks to the expertise he acquired on the “Federal reserve system and its influence upon international money markets”, the latter found a job at a Bancamerica-Blair Corporation branch in Barcelona, before returning definitively to Milan.⁴² However, after the introduction of the “statement of intention” proposed by Day, the problem of extensions to a third year was over.

A crucial issue for the RF program officers was the language skills. Lack of a good command of English could preclude fruitful results; for that reason people appointed to the United States were advised to attend 3–4-month English classes at the London School of Economics, with which the LSRM had an agreement. In Einaudi’s opinion the best way to learn languages was practical training, therefore he could not completely agree with the decision to have fellows spend so much time in England, instead of beginning their research immediately.⁴³ From his point of view

⁴⁰ Letter from A. Gatti to E. E. Day, Chicago, May 10th 1929. TFE, *Documents*. 3 Non Bio, 1929, f. Alessandro Gatti.

⁴¹ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to A. Gatti, June 3^d 1929; handwritten letter from A. Gatti to L. Einaudi, Madison Wiss., June 22th 1929. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Alessandro Gatti.

⁴² Letter from A. Martinenghi to L. Einaudi, New York, June 18th 1929. *Ibid.*, f. Angelo Martinenghi. RAC, RG 10.2 Fellowship Cards: Martinenghi Angelo.

⁴³ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to L. K. Frank, Turin, November 12th 1926; letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi, [New York,] November 27th 1926. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Lawrence K. Frank.

as a fellow, Martinenghi appreciated the language course's high standard, however "the classes could have resulted in being more profitable, if the London School had supplied the Fellows with more opportunities of getting in touch with its students, in order to improve their speaking abilities".⁴⁴

One year later, Renzo Fubini likewise had some reservations about the quality of two seminars he attended at the London School of Economics (one on the theory of salary and one on economic aspects of the international problems); and he was also disappointed about the School of Business Administration lessons, which took the form of inconclusive conversations with students. Nevertheless, he was very grateful to Einaudi for the opportunity of getting, in person, «an idea, even if in a small way, on a country and people, about which fantastic stories were told».⁴⁵

Maybe after these reflections and Einaudi's advice on the limited value of the English classes,⁴⁶ in July 1930 Van Sickle announced a new experimental rule, according to which the fellows went directly to their place of study following a language test held in Rome.⁴⁷

As the advisor, Einaudi had to: provide for the practical needs of the fellows, to be informed of every planning change, must read their periodical reports, give suggestions and provide psychological support. When the scholars applied for a fellowship, in addition to the *curriculum vitae* he reminded them to enclose a short description of their reasons for inquiring about a precise subject in the United States.⁴⁸ This was recommended in order to avoid possible officers' remarks, such as those that arose, for instance, about Mario De Bernardi's list of publications, which – being mostly available in Italy – made a sojourn overseas appear to be unnecessary.⁴⁹ Moreover, for many scholars, who felt overburdened at the beginning of

⁴⁴ Copy of the Statement of the academic work and activities of Mr. Angelo Martinenghi during the first year of his fellowship from October 3, 1927 to Oct. 3, 1928: 1. *Ibid.*, f. Angelo Martinenghi.

⁴⁵ Letter from R. Fubini to L. Einaudi, [London,] November 21st 1929; letter from R. Fubini to L. Einaudi, Cambridge, Mass. June 1st 1930. BECCHIO (2004): 26-27; 32.

⁴⁶ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle, [Turin,] February 25th 1930. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. John Van Sickle.

⁴⁷ «For a while, at any rate, we shall try the experiment of requiring an adequate command of foreign languages as condition of an award. By this we mean that a Fellow should be able to start his research immediately on arrival at the place of study and speak easily after a very short period of tutoring». Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi, [Paris,] July 17th 1930. *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ See f. e.: Copy letter from L. Einaudi to Pagni, [Turin,] April 11th 1931. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Carlo Pagni. Letter from L. Einaudi to M. Ascoli, [Turin,] April 11th 1931. CAMURANI (2011): 232.

⁴⁹ Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi, Paris, July 12th 1930. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. John Van Sickle.

the fellowship, he recalled not only the aim of the RF, but also the stipend amount, which permitted them to save some money, that could be useful at upon their return to Italy.⁵⁰

In their letters to Einaudi the fellows spoke very little of the political or economic situations in the foreign countries where they were staying, but the correspondence of Carlo Pagni – who devoted his research to the «Relations between employers and employee associations; collective bargaining and all other kindred subjects on the organization of employers and workers» – is remarkable. As Giorgio Mortara's student and a collaborator at *La Riforma Sociale*, he visited the most important industrial and agricultural areas in the United States, where he could verify the terrible impact of the 1929 crisis, especially on workers' unionism.⁵¹

Other personal requests troubled the fellows, as happened to Max Ascoli, who, when asked to declare of his profession of faith, preferred not to mention his atheism, because it could sound inauthentic, but hesitated to write “no religious beliefs” – a strategy Jews sometimes used to conceal themselves – because he heard «at the RF they would be quite antisemitic».⁵²

Only when something could discredit the Italian scholars, did Einaudi appear annoyed; that happened with regard to some personal impressions about the English way of life contained in Antonello Gerbi's annual report,⁵³ which irritated an English vice-advisor. Although the episode did not have any consequence for Gerbi, Einaudi suggested with his usual caution to pay less attention to “anything that concerns relations of a political nature, city tours and concentrate instead on the scientific field”.⁵⁴

At the end of 1929, with the transition of the direction to the RF, two important changes were announced: given that appointments and renewals for all fellows had been handled by Van Sickle in the Paris Office, those

⁵⁰ See f. e.: *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to A. Da Empoli*, June 20th 1927. *Ibid.*, f. Attilio Da Empoli.

⁵¹ RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Pagni, Carlo. *Letter from C. Pagni to L. Einaudi*, Chicago, Ill., July 13th 1932. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Carlo Pagni.

⁵² *Letter from M. Ascoli to Einaudi*, Rome, April 21st 1931. CAMURANI (2011): 235.

⁵³ *Letter from A. Gerbi to L. Einaudi*, London, 10th July 1930, TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Antonello Gerbi. «But, to be quite sincere, I cannot say I am already feeling so much at home, as I had succeeded to be in Berlin. I am still imperfectly settled down. Sometimes, when I speak with Englishmen, I am aware of a disagreeable tone of patronizing, and I dare say, of almost a light contempt for the “continental”. I had here also some difficulty at finding a convenient lodging, at knowing people with whom I could speak and improve my English, and, more generally, at coming in closer touch with the life of this country. And, to say all at time, the expenditure is sensibly greater than in Germany.» *A. Gerbi Annual Report (1930)*. *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to A. Gerbi*, [Turin,] July 18th 1930. *Ibid.*

who studied in the United States would now be administered by the Social Science Research Council, because

the members of the Council's staff are in a position to keep in close touch with current developments in the social sciences in this country, and by more or less constant travel around the States, will be able to maintain closer contact with Fellows studying outside of New York. We are not suggesting that the Fellows be closely supervised nor that their research be formed and directed by the Council, but we feel that by frequent contact with the Council's staff, they will realize more than at present from the opportunities presented for research and observation in this country.⁵⁵

Secondly, a formula for short, one-year fellowships was presented for employees in academia, in banks or in other public and semi-public institutions, who could not leave for a longer time. Einaudi was reluctant to approve these shorter fellowships, perhaps because he was worried about the RF becoming indifferent to the future of Italian science.⁵⁶ In Van Sickle's opinion, this formula upheld the RF's practice of supporting scientists with good experience, and could also offer a way to moderate «the present difficulties which returning Italian Fellows have encountered in securing positions».⁵⁷ In general, it seemed desirable to the RF officers to find candidates «of greater maturity», who were able to work independently and had already embarked on an academic career, rather than young scholars, who risked spreading themselves too thin, and not focusing on their topic. Although all European advisors were welcomed to express their comments, they were reminded to keep in mind both of the directives about maturity and existing careers in the selection of future fellows;⁵⁸ the appointments – as Van Sickle explained to Day – would be made one year prior to the departure, to allow fellows “to perfect their language study and to do some systematic reading of the foreign literature of the proposed research”.⁵⁹

In response to Van Sickle's guidelines, Einaudi pondered advantages and disadvantages of different age groups, and although his real preclusion was only to people aged 21 to 23 years (he would not have excluded *a priori*

⁵⁵ Letter from E. E. Day to L. Einaudi, [New York,] November 12th 1929. *Ibid.*, f. Edmund E. Day.

⁵⁶ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle, [Turin,] February 25th 1930. *Ibid.*, f. John Van Sickle.

⁵⁷ Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi, [Paris,] March 10th 1930. *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Other letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi, [Paris,] March 10th 1930. *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Letter from J. Van Sickle to E. E. Day, [Paris,] May 13th 1930. RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES, box 49, folder 375.

46-years-old Nicola Ottokar), he was more oriented towards 24-30-year-old men, among them Giovanni De Maria and Mario De Bernardi.⁶⁰ The RF emphasized “the importance of academic position for returned Fellows”, but it was exceptionally acknowledged, that “there are certain positions outside the academic fold to which ex-fellows may profitably go” – as a researcher in national banks or in public offices. The Paris officer would not eliminate from consideration businessmen, journalists or barristers with scientific interests and qualified publications, who could return to their career at the expiration of the fellowship; but in the case of Italian candidates who met the requirements they were inclined to stretch the age limit.⁶¹

In light of this opportunity given to employees to apply for a one-year fellowship, Einaudi encouraged Carlo Pagni, who at the time worked in the Lombard Division of the General Industrial Confederation and was able to leave his post with the permission of his superiors.⁶²

De Bernardi, who graduated in 1928 from the University of Turin with a thesis on Giovanni Botero’s economic thought, also spent his one-year fellowship in France and England to develop his project on «Precursors of the marginal utility school of economics». In 1933 the final outcome, warmly supported by Einaudi himself, who followed each step of this research,⁶³ was a new edition of selected writings of Jules Dupuit, under the title *De l'utilité et de sa mesure*, as the second volume of *La Riforma Sociale* series.⁶⁴ Back in Italy, De Bernardi was engaged in Italian translations of two books edited by Giulio Einaudi’s publishing house (*The economics of the recovery program*, by Joseph Schumpeter and *New frontiers*, by Henry Agard Wallace⁶⁵); but he encountered “serious political difficulties in attempting to enter the academic career”, having signed, along with other students in 1929, a letter of support for Benedetto Croce for his positions on the relationships between the Church and the Italian State.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle, [Turin,] 15th May 1930. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. John Van Sickle.

⁶¹ Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi, [Paris,] May 23^d 1930. *Ibid*.

⁶² RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Pagni Carlo; TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Carlo Pagni.

⁶³ RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: De Bernardi Mario; TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Mario De Bernardi.

⁶⁴ DUPUIT J. 1933, *De l'utilité et de sa mesure*, Turin: La Riforma Sociale (“Collezione di scritti inediti o rari di economisti”, vol. II).

⁶⁵ WALLACE H.A. 1935, *Nuovi orizzonti*, Torino: Einaudi. This book appeared after Wallace’s *America must choose* translation, which provoked Mussolini’s intervention on his newspaper (Mussolini, “Che cosa vuole l’America?” *Il Popolo d’Italia*, 194, August 17th 1934: 1. Letter from Mario Einaudi to J. Van Sickle, Cambridge Mass., October 7th, 1934. RAC, RG 1.1 751 S, box 8, folder 93, Einaudi, Luigi (Economics), 1931: 1933-1936.

⁶⁶ PARISI (2005): 204. Interview T. B. Kittredge-Mario De Bernardi, Turin, November 29th 1934. RAC, RG 2 General Correspondence 1934, 751 ES, box 110, folder 848.

One of the last fellows was the sociologist Leo Ferrero, who, in October 1930, wrote to Einaudi to receive some advice about his proposal. At the beginning of 1931 he was interviewed in Paris by Van Sickle, who got the impression he was “more of a *littérateur* than a serious scholar”.⁶⁷ In Einaudi's opinion, it was an unsatisfactory judgment, because he had found Ferrero's writings very original.⁶⁸

Following the RF guidelines, the officer was unwilling to accord Ferrero a fellowship to France, where he had been working for several years, but suggested his name for the “Yale seminar on the impact of culture upon personality”, about which Einaudi was informed by Frank.

The officer had explained the goals of the Yale program, which consisted not only of training fellows to analyze and interpret cultural differences “in terms of personality development and adjustment”, but also to acquaint them with methods used to conduct such studies “with the best available practices in this field”.⁶⁹ In order to secure the success of the activity, the advisors were requested to look for 15 students from different countries for an individual one-year fellowship, who were “of sufficient maturity and experience”, and could “bring to the discussions a knowledge of his own culture and social life”; but it was essential that they have a “sympathetic understanding of the problems of personality development” rather than “purely academic or scholarly achievements”.⁷⁰ Postponed to the years 1932-1933, Einaudi thought it would be difficult to find candidates who had the requisite command of spoken English and specific training. In his opinion, those who knew something about psychology and anthropology mostly came from the medical faculties; the criminologists were competent in laboratory work, while jurists and philosophers seemed open-minded but too oriented to theoretical study; finally, there was “the statistical economic group, well versed in population researches, eugenics etc.”.⁷¹ Whereas language problems could be solved with special instruction in English, Frank was inclined to reject anyone who had specialized qualifications or was not interested in human behavior.⁷²

⁶⁷ CAMURANI (2011): 217-218. *Letter from L. Ferrero to L. Einaudi*, Paris, October 15th 1930. TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Leo Ferrero. *Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi*, Paris, March 18th 1931. *Ibid.*, f. John Van Sickle.

⁶⁸ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to Van Sickle*, [Turin,] March 21st 1931. *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ *Letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi*, New York, January 14th 1931. *Ibid.*, f. Lawrence K. Frank.

⁷⁰ *Letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi*, New York, May 21st 1931. *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to L. K. Frank*, [Turin,] May 24th 1931. *Ibid.*

⁷² *Letter from L. K. Frank to L. Einaudi*, New York, June 10th 1931. *Ibid.*

Ferrero appeared to be an ideal candidate.⁷³ During his examination he had to face strange requests, like reading “some curious books on American sociology” and drawing up a 20-page autobiography of his private life.⁷⁴ As it is well known, the young scholar wrote his last letter to Einaudi, only a few days before his trip to New Mexico and his death in Santa Fe, in August 1932, from an automobile accident.

In January 1931, the new RF President Max Mason reorganized the Social Science Fellowship Program and announced the end of the previous system of national advisors; so the appointment of Van Sickle as “fellowship secretary for the Social Sciences in the Paris Office staff” made “the role of the local advisers less important”.⁷⁵ In a May letter to the advisors, Mason offered his gratitude for the high standard, with which they had selected nominees and asked them to continue to informally counsel RF officers.⁷⁶ Van Sickle’s and Kittredge’s reactions to this change were not very enthusiastic, because they feared that they lacked familiarity with European academic affairs and missed the European advisors’ work.⁷⁷ After first expressing his worries about Mason’s directives,⁷⁸ Einaudi was for his part glad to share his experiences, and as his first act, he suggested compiling a list of former fellows, who could offer details on the internal dynamics of European universities. Not so pleased with the new procedures and in accordance with other foreign fellows, who felt they had lost an important point of reference, some Italian scholars carried a motion in support of the previous system of local advisors, but their voices remained unheard.⁷⁹ At the start of 1932, the RF dismissed all of its European advisors with the

⁷³ “You may remember that Mr. Van Sickle mentioned to you the name of Mr. Leo Ferrero. We will be glad to know whether you feel that you would like to submit his name in this connection, or whether you have in mind a better qualified candidate”. *Letter from T. B. Kittredge to L. Einaudi*, Paris, September 24th 1931. *Ibid.*, f. Tracy B. Kittredge (1931-1932).

⁷⁴ *L. Ferrero to L. Einaudi*, Paris, s. d. [Spring 1932]. TFE, *Correspondence*, 2, f. Leo Ferrero. The grant to Ferrero was approved on April 20th 1932. RAC, RG 10.2 *Fellowship Cards*: Ferrero Leo.

⁷⁵ *Copy letter from E. E. Day. The Rockefeller Foundation inter-office*, January 3^d 1931. RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES, box 49, folder 376.

⁷⁶ *Letter from M. Mason to L. Einaudi*, [New York,] May 21st 1931. TFE, *Correspondence*, 2, f. Max Mason. The same letter was sent to all European advisors.

⁷⁷ *Letter from J. Van Sickle to L. Einaudi*, Paris, June 30th 1931. *Ibid.* f. John Van Sickle.

⁷⁸ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle*, [Turin,] July 19th 1931. *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Letter of Italian fellows and former fellows to M. Mason*, s. l. [August 1st 1931]. RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES, box 49, folder 376. At a difference time, this document was signed by Italian (Breglia, Passerin d’Entrèves, Mario Einaudi, Fubini, Martinenghi, Rosenstein Rodan, Rota-Sperti, Vanoni), Czechoslovakian, German and Swiss fellows (K. Spiegel, P. Narthmann, Zdeneck Peska, O. Morgenstern, F. Thalmann, A. Maher, E. Voegelin, R. Freund, R. Heberle, E. Hula, G. Mackenroth, H. Staehle).

exception of two committees in Germany and Great Britain, directed by August Fehling and N. F. Hall.

The presence of the Fascist dictatorship in Italy forced the RF to restrict its intervention only to individual activities, instead of sponsoring, as usual, research institutes and working scientific teams; consequently the management declared "Italy, from the point of view of the SS <Social Sciences>, [...] practically off the map for the time being".⁸⁰ Even though Day was generally satisfied with the RF program for the social sciences, in a letter to Selksar Gunn, the Vice President of European Operations and Assistant Director of the Social Science Programs in Europe, he noted that:

Outside of France and Italy the fellowship program has been a genuine success. Agrees with CSG that the Italian program offers little promises under present conditions. Autocracies, whether they be of the Fascist or Bolshevik variety, create an environment which is altogether hostile to the social science development we are trying to achieve.⁸¹

Since RF officers were "very jealous of maintaining the reputation [...] of being a non-political organization" and did not want to render themselves subject to criticism from the Italian government, they denied assistance to Professor Ruffini, exiled in London (for his refusal to take the Fascist oath), and had some reservations about aiding Luigi Einaudi, who was suffering from political and economic troubles, because of his son Roberto's arrest for antifascist activities.⁸²

As stated by Frédéric Attal, who reconstructed the course of these events, in 1933 the RF officers awarded grants to Einaudi's *La Riforma Sociale* for a couple of years till its definitive closure, in order to "promote research in Italy in the fields of Economic and Planning and Control and International Relations".⁸³ This grant was viewed as a means of funding institutes geared toward independent and objective research in the social sciences, despite the illiberal atmosphere of the dictatorship, as Einaudi

⁸⁰ *Memorandum from Selksar Gunn to E. E. Day*, Cadiz, December 31st 1931. RAC, RG 2 General Correspondence 1931, 700 ES, box 63, folder 516.

⁸¹ *Letter from Day to Selksar Gunn*, New York, January 25th 1932. RAC, RG 2 General Correspondence 1932, 751 S, box 77, folder 618.

⁸² *Letter from S. Gunn to E. E. Day*, Paris, February 1st 1932. RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES, box 49, folder 376. «I do not see how the Foundation could reasonably become involved in the relief of Italian scholars and scientists, who get into trouble with Fascist regime. Of course I share the sympathy which a great many feel in connection with these cases, but for the Foundation to take any official attitude toward the matter would seem to me altogether inexpedient». *Letter from E. E. Day to S. Gunn*, [New York,] March 2^d 1932. *Ibid.*

⁸³ ATTAL (2013). *Research Aid Grants. Paris, May 9, 1933*. RAC, RG 1.1 751 S, box 8, folder 93, Einaudi, Luigi (Economics), 1931: 1933-1936

himself described in his letters to Van Sickle. Two problems came into light: the difficulty for scientists and young scholars to work in the universities without compromising with the Fascist party and their restriction to purely theoretical studies. The news about the worsening Italian situation also reached Sydnor H. Walker (one of the few women named as RF Associate Director), who in April 1933 told Van Sickle, "Italy needs now as never before our fellowships, as the political situation is in such turmoil".⁸⁴ It might be argued that Walker interpreted this action in favor Einaudi's review as a recompense for the great Italian's "valuable services in the past in administration of our fellowship program",⁸⁵ while in Van Sickle's opinion it was, rather, an effort "to keep alive in a scattered group of scholars the scientific spirit which is so threatened in Italy".⁸⁶ However, after these funds were exhausted, there would be few prospects of continuing the cooperation in that form. Aside from the occasional grant-in-aid to former fellows, extensive operations seemed unlikely and in the late 1930s the RF's contacts with Italy were significantly reduced.

In the meantime, Einaudi had been requested to formulate his remarks about the fellowship program's success in Italy. He perceived the fellowship experience as an opportunity to achieve "a very strong qualification not only for the academic career, but for other careers too, in which a scientific mind and an acquaintance with foreign problems are valuable" – as Italian former fellows' careers proved.⁸⁷ In short, he noted that the strong points of the RF plan consisted principally in its flexibility.⁸⁸

In the process of promoting the RF's fellowship program in the mid-1920s, Luigi Einaudi's contribution as an advisor was crucial, because he played a key role in mediating between different requirements. First, he had to protect the RF mission in light of the intemperances of some Italian fellows, who intended to utilize the fellowships to secure a career abroad, and consequently deprive Italy of a young generation of scholars, able to feel at ease with new methodologies and standards of studying the social sciences. Second, since the RF program in Europe was still in an experi-

⁸⁴ *Letter from S. H. Walker to J. Van Sickle*, [New York,] April 11th, 1933. *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Letter from S. H. Walker to J. Van Sickle*, [New York,] April 27th, 1933. *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ *Letter from J. Van Sickle to S. H. Walker*, May 17th, 1933; «We did not wish to give the impression that we were approving the grant-in-aid to Professor Einaudi simply to dispose of an obligation for his services. We anticipate that the results of this grant-in-aid will be as a beneficial as you have indicated they might be». *Letter from S. H. Walker to J. Van Sickle*, [New York,] May 18th, 1933. *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle*, [Turin,] August 8th 1932. TFE, *Correspondence*, 2, f. John Van Sickle (1932).

⁸⁸ *Copy letter from L. Einaudi to J. Van Sickle*, [Turin,] September 24th 1932. *Ibid.*

mental phase, without a fixed procedure about some questions (e.g. married fellows, extra family allowance, prolongations of the fellowships to a third year, etc.), he tried to find reasonable and shared solutions, which safeguarded both parties' interests.

Thus, Einaudi's diplomatic actions were always aimed at preserving the presence of Italy in the RF program, in order to keep alive connections between Italian research and the international academic environment, especially to avoid the scientific isolation of the country during the Fascist dictatorship. It bears mentioning that there were long-lasting relationships between former fellows and the American philanthropic organization, as in the case of Mario Einaudi and Alessandro Passerin d'Entrèves. Although they took up their academic careers in the United States and England, their familiarity with American policies enabled them in the 1960s to succeed in their requests for financial assistance for the Institute of Political Science in Turin. Thanks to RF support, this was then transformed in 1969 into a Faculty.⁸⁹ Apparently far beyond the foresight of the RF program officers, this example proved the successful undertaking of the RF policy and Einaudi's engagement.

REFERENCES

- ATTAL F. 2013, "Luigi Einaudi, la Fondazione Rockefeller e le scienze sociali in Italia", *Ventesimo Secolo*, 31: 41-62.
- 2010, "Reconstruire l'Europe intellectuelle: les sciences sociales en Italie (1945-1970)", in L. Tournès, *L'argent de l'influence. Les fondations américaines et leurs réseaux européens*, Paris: Éditions Autrement: 143-163.
- BARUCCI P., BINI P. and CONIGLIELLO L. (eds.) 2017, *Economia e diritto in Italia durante il fascismo: approfondimenti, biografie, nuovi percorsi di ricerca*, Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- BECCHIO G. 2004, "Renzo Fubini, da allievo del Laboratorio a professore di Economia e finanza: una ricostruzione attraverso il carteggio con Luigi Einaudi (1928-1943)", *Annali della Fondazione Einaudi*, 38: 13-58.
- BECCHIO G. and MARCHIONATTI R. (eds.) 2005, *La Scuola di Economia di Torino. Da Cognetti de Martiis a Einaudi*, Torino: Celid.
- CAMURANI E. (ed.) 2011, "Max Ascoli borsista Rockefeller: una scelta americana nelle lettere a Luigi Einaudi. Con un contributo alla biografia di Ascoli", *Annali della Fondazione Einaudi*, 45: 215-277.
- DA EMPOLI D. 2007, "The Role of the Rockefeller Foundation in the Training of Italian Economists", in P.F. Asso and L. Fiorito (eds.), *Economics and Institutions. Contributions*

⁸⁹ Mario Einaudi and Alessandro Passerin d'Entrèves had contacts with a second generation of RF officers, represented by Norman S. Buchanan, Gerald Freund and Kenneth W. Thompson.

- from the History of Economic Thought. Selected Papers from the 8th Aispe Conference*, Milano: FrancoAngeli: 406-414.
- 2004, “Renzo Fubini e Attilio Da Empoli Rockefeller fellows”, *Annali della Fondazione Einaudi*, 38: 131-138.
- D.P. [PARISI D.] 2005, “A Fruitfull Experience away from the University of Turin: Luigi Einaudi and the Rockefeller Foundation”, *Storia del Pensiero Politico*, 2: 204-205.
- EINAUDI L.R. 2010, “Le molteplici eredità. Un ricordo personale di Luigi Einaudi”, in R. Marchionatti and P. Soddu (eds.), *Luigi Einaudi nella cultura, nella società e nella politica del Novecento. Atti del convegno tenuto presso la Fondazione Luigi Einaudi (Torino, 16-17 aprile 2009)*, Firenze: L. S. Olschki: 309-335.
- FAUCCI R. 1986, *Luigi Einaudi*, Torino: Utet.
- FIRPO L. (ed.) 1969, “Lettere di Luigi Einaudi ad Attilio Da Empoli (1926-1930)”, *Annali della Fondazione Einaudi*, 3: 383-399.
- FOSDICK R.B. 1952, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation*, New York: Harpers & Brothers.
- GEMELLI G. 2005, “Un imprenditore scientifico e le sue reti internazionali: Luigi Einaudi, la Fondazione Rockefeller e la professionalizzazione della ricerca economica in Italia”, *Le Carte e la Storia*, 11 (1): 189-202.
- GEMELLI G. and MACLEOD R. (eds.) 2003, *American Foundations in Europe: Grant-giving Policies, Cultural Diplomacy and Trans-atlantic Relations, 1920-1980*, Bruxelles: P.I.E. Peter Lang.
- HEILBRON J., GUILHOT N. and JEANPIERRE L. (eds.) 2009, “Vers une histoire transnationale des sciences sociales”, *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 73: 121-145.
- KRIGE J. 2006, *American Egemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- KRIGE J. and RAUSCH H. (eds.) 2012, *American Foundations and the Coproduction of World Order in the Twentieth Century*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- MALANDRINO C. and BRAVO G.M. (eds.) 2000, *Una rivista all'avanguardia. La Riforma sociale 1894-1935*, Firenze: L. S. Olschki.
- MARCHIONATTI R. (ed.) 2000, *From our Italian Correspondent. Luigi Einaudi's Articles on «The Economist», 1908-1946*, 2 vols., Firenze: L. S. Olschki.
- MARIUZZO A. 2011, “Stato-nazione e mobilità degli studenti universitari dall'Unità alla Repubblica. La situazione degli studi”, *Storicamente*, 7: 1-9.
- PARISI D. 2007, “Overseas Pioneering Specialization in Economics in the 1920s: the Case of Luigi De Simone”, in PF. Asso and L. Fiorito (eds.), *Economics and Institutions*: 415-440.
- SILVESTRINI M.T. 2002, *La Fondazione Luigi Einaudi. Storia di una istituzione culturale*, Torino: Fondazione Luigi Einaudi Press.
- TOURNÈS L. 2008, “La Fondation Rockefeller et la construction d'une politique des sciences sociales en France (1918-1940)”, *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 63 (6): 1371-1402.
- 2007, “La Fondation Rockefeller et la naissance de l'universalisme philanthropique américain”, *Critique Internationale*, 35: 173-197.
- WELLS A. E. 2005, “Considering Her Influence: Sydnor H. Walker and Rockefeller Support for Social Work, Social Scientists, and Universities in the South”, in A. Walton (ed.), *Women and Philanthropy in Education*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 127-147.

APPENDIX A*

LETTERS BETWEEN
LUIGI EINAUDI AND WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH,
BEARDSLEY RUML, LAWRENCE K. FRANK, EDMUND E. DAY,
JOHN VAN SICKLE, MAX MASON, SELKSAR GUNN

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH

1.

William E. Lingelbach to Luigi Einaudi¹

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
Paris, 11ème
October 26th., 1925

My dear Professor Einaudi,

I have been authorized through Dr. Beardsley Ruml, Director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in New York, to invite you to represent the Memorial in the nomination of Italian candidates for travelling fellowships in the Social Sciences and matters appertaining thereto. An honorarium of one thousand dollars (\$1000) is attached to the position, and all reasonable expenses incurred in the administration of the Fellowship program are, of course, paid by the Memorial.

The enclosed statement concerning the fellowship plan and the «Instructions to Representatives», added to my earlier communications shortly after my visit to Turin, will give you the necessary information as to the functions of the Representatives.

They are, I think, self-explanatory, but if there are any questions that arise in your mind concerning them, please write me. A further point for your consideration concerns the visit of the Representative to the United States. This is, usually a trip of about two months and at the expense of the Memorial. The time of the vi-

* Appendix A and B publish a selection of the correspondence between Luigi Einaudi and (i) RF officers; (ii) Italian fellows, on relevant aspects of the RF fellowship program (with the exception of two letters). Single correspondents are ordered thematically, but in each section the letters appear chronologically.

¹ TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Wilhelm E. Lingelbach.

sit can be arranged to suit your convenience, though the late spring or early fall is the best, because at that time American scholars in the Social Sciences are at their own Universities with their students, ready to welcome European colleagues.

If you will write me your acceptance, I will communicate with Dr. Ruml in New York, who will then write you direct confirming the arrangement.

Needless to say, I am very pleased at the happy outcome of our negotiations, and with the altogether auspicious beginnings under your direction of our Fellowship system in your country. If at all possible, I shall return to Italy early next month to talk over with you the general program and our faith in the possibilities of the plan for the closer co-operations of scholars in the Social Sciences.

Looking forward to seeing you then, I am, with regards,

Sincerely yours,
William E. Lingelbach

P.S. Will you let me know when in the course of the next weeks I can see you either at Turin or some other place that may be more convenient for you?

BEARDSLEY RUML

2.

Beardsley Ruml to Luigi Einaudi²

Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
[New York,] 28th December 1925

My dear Professor Einaudi:

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Memorial, held on the 8th October 1925, the following resolution was passed:

RESOLVED, that for Italy, Professor Luigi Einaudi Director of the Economic Institute at the University of Turin be, and he hereby is, appointed to represent the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in the nomination of Italian candidates for traveling fellowships in the Social Sciences and matters appertaining thereto.

I am very happy indeed to learn from Professor Lingelbach that it is possible for you to accept the responsibility of representing us in connection with the fellowship appointments in Italy. I am sure that Professor Lingelbach has given you much information concerning the plan, but I am looking forward to having you with us in this country, to visit some of the more important universities from the standpoint of their work in the Social Sciences, and to talk with some of the Fel-

² All the letters number 2-7 are stored in: TFE, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Beardsley Ruml.

lows from other, countries who are here, so that you may learn at first hand the problems that such a plan as this creates.

Provision has been made for an annual honorarium of \$1,000, and in addition expenses will be paid for travel in Italy necessary in selecting Fellows. The first quarterly remittance in connection with the honorarium will be made on the 31st March 1926, covering the quarter commencing January 1, 1926.

Please let me know, as soon as your plans are definitely formed, when you can visit this country.

Yours very sincerely,
Beardsley Ruml

3.

Luigi Einaudi to Beardsley Ruml

Turin, 12th [November] 1926

Dear Mr. Ruml,

The unfortunate accident, which has befallen me on July 28 (and, alas! the leg was not broken at the "ankle" as was written then, but at the haunch, perhaps the worst place in which legs can be broken) has not given way as yet to complete recovery. I am now walking on crutches in my rooms; and it is very improbable that I will be able to go out of home before New Year.

I have endeavoured, however, to entertain correspondence with colleagues at Milan, Rome, Florence, Pavia, Genoa and Naples on the subject of the fellowships. The plan, about which I circularized a confidential memorandum, was very well appreciated. Candidates will surely come out next year. But I am sorry to report that my hopes of being able to make, in addition to Mr. D'Entrèves appointment in England, nominations of fellowships in the United States, for the current term did not materialize. That very able young man, signor Edoardo Ruffini-Avondo, about whom I spoke you, was not able to leave Italy, on account of wife and baby. With other three young men, a different obstacle rose: the offer made to them of a university teaching situation. The rise of new schools in economic and political sciences (Rome and Pavia) and of business schools (Catania, Trieste, Naples) made in the current year easy even for young men of 25 years to get an assistant-professorship; and of course their enthusiasm about fellowships suffered very much. My feeling is that I will be obliged to limit my choice to men between 22 and 25-26 years, who, being bachelors and not tied by professional or academic situation, are anxious of making acquaintance with new countries and different institutions and learning-methods.

As in other cases the only disqualification was the imperfect knowledge of English language, I am strongly urging several promising young men to practice earnestly English speaking.

Believe me, with my best salutations,

your very sincerely
Luigi Einaudi

4.

Beardsley Ruml to Luigi Einaudi

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
New York, November 30th 1926

My dear Dr. Einaudi,

We were all so distressed to hear of your accident and I am sorry to learn that you are still not completely recovered. It is so discouraging to be the victim of an accident that is so long in righting itself. I hope that you will not be discouraged in the difficulties which you have had in connection with the men of which you had thought of as fellowship candidates. In the beginning there is sure to be some difficulty and I believe that as the plan becomes better known in Italy and the high status of the candidates is more generally recognized, men will cease to prefer the immediate teaching position to the opportunity for further study and research. We are not anxious for large numbers of fellows and will be gratified if only the quality of the few who are selected is up to the highest standard.

With cordial personal regards and good wishes,

Very sincerely,
Luigi Einaudi

5.

Luigi Einaudi to Beardsley Ruml

Turin, May 10 1927

Dear Dr. Ruml,

You will excuse me if the present letter containing nominations to the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial fellowships for the next academic year, was, owing to unavoidable and unforeseen circumstances, somewhat delayed; but I hope that the Executive Council will be able to consider it before summer recess.

Being the first time I have the privilege of making proposals to the Memorial, I beg you to consider them as tentative, both as regards the number and the qualifications of young men nominated for fellowships. Any modification by the Council of the proposals made will be gladly received by me as a guide for future years.

I think advisable to explain, in a preliminary way, a few technicalities of our system of honours and graduations which will be mentioned below.

Training in secondary schools is given in Italy for five years in gymnasium and for these succeeding years in lyceum, corresponding to the German classic gymnasium. At about 18 years of age youngmen are declared "mature" and enter from the lyceum into the University.

During the University years (four in the Faculties of Jurisprudence, Literature and Science, in the Schools of Business or Commerce and Economics, five in the Schools of Engineering, six in the Faculty of Medicine), students must pass

special examinations, from 15 to 25 according to Faculties, on single courses. The maximum number of marks or points is 30 (I). In cases of special excellence, examiners can add cum laude. Examinations are oral.

At the end of the curriculum, after having passed all special examinations, students are admitted to the general examination for doctorship's degrees. The maximum number of marks or points here is 110, the examiners being in this case eleven. In cases of special excellence, examiners can add cum laude, and when they are of opinion that the written dissertation by the student to the Faculty is worth to be brought to the notice of scholars, they sometimes add also the mention "the dissertation is worth printing". As it is easy to imagine, these qualifications are not strictly comparable, as they depend from the variable severity or indulgence of Faculties in different Universities; and it happens not infrequently that a young man, however highly qualified from a special point of view is unable to obtain the maximum honours. But they are, within limits, a guide to a general appreciation.

After graduation, youngmen, aiming to enter the academic career, sometimes, are appointed "assistants" to professors. But in the social sciences field, assistants are very few and practically limited to the Catholic and Commercial Universities of Milan, to the Political Sciences Departments of Rome and Pavia and to a few Schools of Business. Also, young men can be appointed readers or substitutes to professors, or private docents; in this last case after a competitive examination yearly held at Rome.

Private docents can hold special courses, open to, but not compulsory for students, in whatever University they may prefer, after agreement by the Faculty.

My proposal is that the Memorial shall consider the advisability of appointing all or some of six youngmen, whom, after a rigorous selection amongst candidates, I felt able to consider worth of the distinction. [...]

From the point of view of the English language certification, the order of merit should be changed thus:

1. Mario Einaudi
2. Angelo Martinenghi
3. Luigi De Simone, Pietro Rota-Sperti
5. Alessandro Gatti
6. Attilio Da Empoli

My son could leave Italy straight for the States, because he speaks English easily; and the same could almost be said for signor Martinenghi. For both, however, I would suggest that a stay in London for October and part or the whole of November, would be useful so as to follow courses at the London School of Economics and become thoroughly conversant with hearing lectures and participate to students debates. To my son a short preliminary stay in London would also be useful to the completion of his paper on Burke.

To all other candidates the full three months training from September 1st to November's end at the London School would be more or less necessary and in all cases very useful. Signor Da Empoli is more a beginner; but he is undergoing at present strenuous preliminary exercise-work at home and I fully trust that the London training will complete his knowledge of English language.

Expressions of wishes as to place and subjects of study are, of course, wholly indicative and all fellows, if appointed, will be only too glad to follow the advice of the Memorial's officers and of their professors. I don't think that regular registration in Universities is primarily to be considered advisable. Independent research, with University professor's advice, should be the aim.

I have endeavored not to select my candidates from only one region: two (signori Einaudi and Gatti) were born in Piedmont; two (signori Rota-Sperti and Martinenghi) in Lombardy; and two (signori De Simone and Da Empoli) in the South of Italy. The aim was that the benefit of intellectual intercourse between the United States and Italy promoted by the fellowship's plan could be, as far as possible, extended to youngmen representative of the different sections of our 41 millions population.

All candidates will be glad to resign the positions, if any, hitherto held; and I don't recommend that in fixing stipend accounts be taken of salaries lost.

I fell, however, my duty to explain the special situation of dr Alessandro Gatti. He is the only married man, among the six candidates. He is well aware that bringing to America wife and baby would be an handicap to his researches and he has told me that he is prepared to leave them at home. I suppose that his wife has a small personal income and that she will retire herself to her mother's home during her husband's absence. This determination does honor dr Gatti and is an additional evidence of his enthusiasm for scientific research. I fear, however, that he may be tempted – perhaps with damage to his tranquillity of mind – to save something out of his stipend as fellow, so as to be able to send an aid to family at home. Therefore, while not making a formal recommendation, I think that it would be advisable to consider, whether, taking account of the loss of income, greater than in other cases, and of family conditions, an increase of stipend should be granted to him. An additional sum of 600 dollars a year would be amply sufficient to put dr Gatti and his family's mind quite at ease.

Examinations and honors certificates by Universities authorities are annexed, with translation. Also medical certificates, with translation, photographs, and personal history records. Letters of recommendation are also annexed in original. Owing to stress of time, I was unable to translate them fully, but I have marked the essential passages, which I have reproduced in the present letter between inverted commas. Statements of candidates plan of work were discussed in personal interview with me and a summary notice of them is included in the personal history record. Owing to unforeseen delay, doctorship's certificate of signor Martinenghi will be sent May 13.

Hoping that the present letter has not run to undue length, I am with kindest regards,

very sincerely yours
Luigi Einaudi

(1) Sometimes the maximum can be 40 or 50 when the number of examiners is 4 or 5 instead of the regular 3. In these cases the certificates mention the fact, by saying that marks or points, were, for instance, 30 or 35 on 40.

6.

Luigi Einaudi to Beardsley Ruml

Turin, February 14, 1928
60 via Lamarmora

Dear Dr. Ruml,

In accordance with a view about which there was a general consensus at the end of the Paris meeting of the European representatives of the Memorial, I have not sent a special memorandum on the results of the said meeting. The protocol which was approved by all the representatives, embodies the conclusions of what was a very helpful opportunity of exchanging views.

On the question of the distinction between married and unmarried men, about which general agreement was not reached, I think, however, useful to explain my personal opinion:

- that fellowships should be granted to married men only in very exceptional cases, when the representative is satisfied that the married status will not impair the usefulness of the fellowship;
- that, in these exceptional cases, the representative should limit himself to state conditions of family, of personal income, as far as known to him; the amount of stipend to be fixed by the Memorial so as to observe, as far as possible, the rule of equal treatment for fellows of different nations;
- that no increase of stipend should be granted to fellows marrying after application for fellowship. Perhaps an item could be introduced in the personal history record such as:

“What are your prospects about marriage until the end of the “fellowship’s period?” or, if such a formal query is considered inadvisable, the representative should be instructed to make confidential inquiry about it.

Another point on which I desire to draw your attention is the participation of the Mediterranean countries to the Fellowship’s plan. No doubt, the Northern and Central Europe contributions to the development of social sciences is preponderating. But I am under the impression that there are social problems of first rate magnitude also in the Southern countries, whose study would be promoted by the coming into contact of young men from these countries with the United States and with Central and Northern Europe. The absence of Spain from the plan seems to be the point worthy of study. Spain has made in recent years astonishing progress in industry commerce and agriculture. As far as I am able to judge from the perusal of the Revista Nacional de Economía of Madrid, social problems and new economics theories are keenly discussed in Spain. I had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of some of the young men who study in Italy in the Spanish College of the University of Bologna, and one of them was a promising man in the economic field. Spain still exercises a powerful intellectual influence on Central and South America and is therefore of interest to the United States.

Of course these impressions are not a sufficient basis for extending the fellowship plan to Spain. They suggest however, that perhaps the matter is worth studying. Believe me

yours sincerely
Luigi Einaudi

7.

Luigi Einaudi to Beardsley Ruml

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
New York, 21 December, 1928

Dear Dr Einaudi:

If present plans are carried through – and there is every reason to believe they twill be – the program in the social sciences, which the Memorial has been fostering for the past five or six years, will be transferred on January 3, 1929, to the Rockefeller Foundation, by merger of the Memorial with the Foundation. The system of fellowships in the social sciences will be moved with the remainder of the social science program.

The shift will be made with virtually no changes in the existing administrative procedures. The present representatives will be reappointed as Fellowship Advisors in the Social Sciences for the Rockefeller Foundation. The duties of the Fellowship Advisors will be for the present identical with those performed by the Memorial's representatives. In brief, from the point of view of the fellowship system, the contemplated reorganization involves changes which in no wise effect the procedure with which the Memorial's representatives have been familiar. Formal notification of reappointment will doubtless be sent forward as soon as definitive action has been taken by the appropriate Foundation authorities. Mr. Day, who has been appointed Director for the social sciences in the Foundation, will continue to have general charge of the fellowship program in this field. Any questions you may wish to raise about the new arrangements consequently may be addressed to him. With best wishes for the New Year,

Sincerely yours,
Beardsley Ruml

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

8.

Luigi Einaudi to Lawrence K. Frank³Turin, November 12th, 1926

Dear Mr. Frank,

I enclose a copy of the letter, which I send today to Dr. Ruml.

May I add two questions:

First, as I see in the instructions that proposals for fellowships can be sent at any time, and as, for the reason given, it was not possible to make a nomination for the first term of the academic year, what would be the latest date at which nominations for the second term could be considered?

Secondly, I feel strongly that a young man with an initial knowledge of english (through reading and a little speaking) can in a few weeks be able to profit from lectures and classes in your universities. For instance, if he could find hospitality in the International House of New York City daily intercourse with other young english speaking men would make him shortly conversant with your language; and in the meantime he could very well utilize time in library rooms and seminars. It seems to me that the London arrangement is the best as a preface to the first term; but if any fellow will be appointed in march, a plan for giving him from one to two months training in America seems worthy to be considered.

Believe me, dear Mr. Frank,

Yours sincerely

Luigi Einaudi

9.

Lawrence K. Frank to Luigi Einaudi

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial

New York, November 27th, 1926

My dear Professor Einaudi:

I am hastening to answer your letter of November 12th in regard to the Fellowships.

The second term at the universities begins January first for those on the quarter system and February first for those on the semester basis. Since it takes about ten days to two weeks after receipt of a nomination to obtain action from our

³ All the letters number 9-12 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*, 2, f. Lawrence K. Frank.

Executive Committee you should allow about three weeks for the nomination to be passed upon and then add the necessary time for the candidate to reach the place of study.

The instruction in English in London is not compulsory but is advisable for any Fellows who may need practice. So far as I know, the courses in English at the London School are available only in the fall, but I will ask Mrs. Mair to write you if any other time is available. We have made no plans for instruction in English in this country and I am not sure whether we can find facilities for that purpose equal to those provided in Landon. Consequently, I would suggest that Fellows defer their coming to the United States until they have a fairly good acquaintance with the English spoken language.

In regard to the difficulty about finding desirable candidates for the Fellowships because of the number of academic positions now being created, may I suggest the possibility that you discuss with these schools the question of their selecting men for their faculties, a year or two in advance, with the idea of having these prospective teachers spend a year of study here or elsewhere as a means of rounding out their professional training for those positions. This should be of interest to the educational institutions, since it would help them to develop their faculties by giving these young members a wider professional experience. In this way, the Fellowship plan could be directly related to the building up of the educational institutions in Italy which would insure cooperation by the various institutions in the selection of the promising young social scientists of the future.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence K. Frank

10.

Lawrence K. Frank to Luigi Einaudi

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
New York, May 27th 1927

My Dear Professor Einaudi:

After your rather pessimistic forecast about the possibility of finding fellowship candidates your nomination of six candidates is very interesting indeed. I presume that you have tapped an accumulated demand for foreign study and that in succeeding years the numbers will be somewhat smaller. I think probably we should be inclined to suggest that for future years six Fellows, all for study in the United States, would not be in proportion to the numbers coming from other countries, although you might find it desirable to nominate as many as six if two or more were to go to other European countries for study.

May I comment specifically upon the individual candidates, and say, that we had no difficulty in considering Dr. Gatti since in this country, as you know, psychology is considered one of the social sciences, although it does have close

affiliations with the natural science group. It would be well for Dr. Gatti while in London to get acquainted with the National Institute of Industrial Psychology and the English and American literature on this subject. Undoubtedly the work at Harvard will prove of great interest to him but I do not think he will find it desirable to commit himself to Clark University, since Dr. Hunter, of whom he speaks, is interested in animal psychology.

Dr. Rota-Sperti, Dr. de Simone, Dr. da Empoli, and Dr. Martinenghi are all in the field of economics and we shall be very much interested to see how they like the American economists and their methods. Incidentally, I should mention that two or three Fellows who have been in this country during the past year are hoping to go to Italy next year or the year after to gain a closer acquaintance with the Italian schools, particularly those concerned with mathematical analyses of economic data.

While the suggested places of study for these Fellows are quite appropriate, I would again repeat my statement about the desirability of not making any commitments before the Fellows actually arrive here since some of the specific individuals whom you mention may not be in residence at their universities when the Fellows arrive.

May I say that we quite understood and appreciated your feelings in regard to the nomination of your son, and in view of the fact that he comes with the endorsement of Professor Solari I think you, need not have any qualms in the matter.

Another matter I should like to speak of is this: I think your Italian Fellows should all be instructed to pursue a fairly definite policy about their discussion of the political, economic and social developments in Italy. Since they will be coming here fresh from home they will be importuned, I have no doubt, to give information and express opinions, and in this era of journalism and publicity, whatever they say might find its way into the public print to the embarrassment of the Fellows and of the Memorial, because as you know, the subject is a controversial one in this country and I should hate to see their status here compromised in any way by their utterances on what is after all a matter extraneous to their scientific interests. Naturally, I do not wish to suggest in any way that we wish to censor their speech or to impose complete silence upon them, but I do want to speak frankly of a possible danger, a prior knowledge of which may serve to guide them safely.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence K. Frank

11.

Luigi Einaudi to Lawrence K. Frank

Turin, June 18, 1927

My Dear Mr Frank,

May I thank the Memorial Executive Council, Dr Ruml and yourself for the ready acceptance of the nominations made by me in last May?

My first forecasts were as you rightly remember, rather [...] perhaps my attention was then [...] to young men who had already [...] who, being on the eve of gaining an academic positions, were not able to follow my [...] about American Fellowships. As, however, after correspondence with colleagues and without any publicity, the Memorial Fellowships were better known, my difficulty became quite different, changing into the need of selection among too many applicants. Some of them would have been able to apply in previous years so that for the first time the number was somewhat swelled above the average. I feel therefore, that next years nominations will decrease in number.

I hope to receive shortly the official appointment letters, so that fellows may apply at once for passports, a thing which usually in Italy requires some time.

I appreciate very much the observations you make on the opportunity of fellows keeping themselves as far as possible out of political controversies and of newspapermen. Suggestions on that line I had already done to all fellows, and I am sure that they will act on them,

I am glad to see that Memorial Fellows are coming to Italy, where they will be able to gather a good harvest in the scientific field. May I advise them that from July to October academic life is slumbering and opportunities of meeting professors practically begin in October's last days?

I think you will be interested in reading copy of a letter which I have received from the Secretary of the Board of Education for Librarianship Chicago, Ill., and the reply I have sent her.

I have just received "The rise of American Civilization" by Charles and Mary Beard and I thank you very much for a gift which will be, no doubt, greatly appreciated also by my colleagues and students. I remember reading about a quarter of a century ago a short book by the same Charles Beard on Industrial Revolution; and I have no doubt that the present fruit of his maturer years will give me true enjoyment and material for thought.

With my best regards, I am,

very sincerely yours

Luigi Einaudi

12.

Luigi Einaudi to Lawrence K. Frank

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
New York, July 15 1927

Professor Senator Luigi Einaudi
60 Via Lamarmora,
Turin, Italy

Thank you for your letter with reference to the fact that the American Library Association has been writing to the Memorial Representatives in Europe requesting that they recommend librarians for appointment to Memorial Fellowships.

Since the Memorial is not at present concerned with the development of libraries and is not prepared to extend the field of study for fellowship nominees I should like to anticipate any action you might be inclined to take in this matter and ask that you do not make such nominations.

In accordance with our present policies, nominations for fellowships should be confined to those who will devote their time to the social sciences as outlined in the letter of instruction to representatives. From time to time it may be found desirable to include under the fellowship plan individuals who are primarily concerned with obtaining a broader professional acquaintance in some of the fields in which the Memorial is also interested, such as social service, the administration of social welfare, criminology, and child research and parent education. Such exceptions, however, are always to be in favor of specific individuals, who because of their connection with the activities in these fields will commend themselves as desirable candidates to come to this country to observe the organization and administration of these several fields of work.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence K. Frank

EDMUND E. DAY

13.

Edmund E. Day to Luigi Einaudi⁴

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial
New York, May 9 1928

My dear Professor Einaudi:

There are three or four points in the administration of the fellowships being held in Europe that I wish to comment on to the Representatives.

First, leave of absence from the authorized place of study. It has been the policy of the Memorial not to grant stipend to a Fellow while he is in his native country, except on the authorized trip home between a second and third year. Stipend for this visit is authorized for only three months. At any other time, when a Fellow leaves his place of study and returns to his own country, stipend is suspended from the day he leaves his place of study until the day he returns. Our only assurance that this policy will be observed is that the Fellow understands this procedure and that he can be relied upon to report such departures to the Memorial Representative in the country in which he is studying. However, the appointments are made for twelve consecutive months, or sometimes two consecutive

⁴ TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Edmund E. Day.

twelve-month periods. Interruptions for visits back home should be discouraged. Exception is made, of course, in cases of illness or very urgent business. Even in these exceptional cases, the stipend is suspended. The departure and return of the Fellow should be communicated to the Receiving Representative. The terminating date of the fellowship is moved forward the number of days that the stipend is suspended. We would ask the Representatives kindly to make these points clear to their Fellows who are studying in Europe and to inform the Memorial of the exact dates of suspension and resumption or stipends.

Second, payment of tuition. Under the term tuition, we would include the charges for instruction directly connected with a Fellow's authorized program of study, and any fixed fees that have to be paid by all students registered at a university. At some American universities, there are registration fees, medical fees and even athletic fees that every student must pay regardless of the course he is following, graduate or undergraduate. The Memorial assumes these fixed charges. However, the Fellow must first pay the bill himself, then forward the receipt to the Representative in the country in which he is studying. The Representative should indicate on the receipt whether the bill, in whole or in part, should be paid by the Memorial, and forward the receipt to the New York office. The Fellow will then be reimbursed by a draft drawn in his name.

Third, extension of fellowships to a third year. The Memorial thinks that on the whole, plans for research should be scaled to occupy at the most two years. Only in very exceptional cases does a third year seem warranted. The statement that a Fellow has been unable to finish his research in the allotted time would not be considered an adequate argument in favor of an extension.

Fourth, irregular appointments. It is the desire of the Memorial to conform as much as possible to the needs of individual candidates proposed by the Representatives. However, some thought must be given to the difficulties of administration created by irregular appointments. Stipends are now fairly well regulated. Communications between Representatives concerning Fellows going from one country to another have been systematized. Appointments for study in a country where the Memorial has no representative, however, should be carefully considered. A candidate proposed for study in these countries should be an exceptional person of mature judgment, one capable of pursuing independent research without supervision, and conscientious in the accomplishment of his set goal. He should also be well grounded in his subject and have considerable acquaintance with the conditions in his proposed place of study. Unless a candidate has these qualifications, the Memorial would not be inclined to appoint him a Fellow.

Very sincerely yours,
Edmund E. Day

JOHN VAN SICKLE

14.

Luigi Einaudi to John Van Sickle⁵

[Turin,] February 25, 1930

Dear Dr. Van Sickle,

Mrs Einaudi was very sensible to the kind letters which Mrs. Van. Sickle and you have written her; and we are both very happy indeed that yours recollection of Turin are so favourable. On my part I hope that the opportunity thus given me of meeting you personally will bring good results for the working of the fellowship plan. The necessity of a colloquial command of english language may cause come delay; but I conceer fully with you in thinking that the delay can be most usefully be utilised in the preparation for the research to be undertaken in the United States or other foreign countries.

The only suggestion which leaves me somewhat uneasy is the reduction, in a general way, of the fellowship period to 12 to 15 months. If it were a general rule, well; but I cannot see how such a special rule for Italian fellows could work as they would feel to be put on a comparatively inferior level, a feeling for many reasons to be avoided. The gist of the matter is in the selection of young man, whom I know that they will come back to take a position in Italy. This will surely be a most anxious and decisive point for me. The best way is perhaps not to change the case in its special merits. Under a separate cover I send you an essay on the international cooperation in taxation, published in French as a reprint from the *Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de droit International*. There is in the fifth and in the sixth chapters and especially in § 78 a few hints, which I have developed in the other essays which I was greatly pleased to give you as the only American scholar, who as studied the problem.

Sincerely yours,
Luigi Einaudi

15.

Luigi Einaudi to John Van Sickle

Turin, May 15, 1930

Dear Dr. Van Sickle,

This year, in pursuance of the interview which we had in February past and the letters exchanged, my suggestions, as to nomination of new Italian Rockefel-

⁵ All the letters number 14-19 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. John Van Sickle.

ler fellows, are somewhat more limited in number. While I concur in the advisability of sending, men of greater maturity to study in the United States or in other European countries, I have encountered in that way some difficulties, which it is perhaps well to explain.

The situation of candidates as to age distribution seems to me to be in Italy the following:

- I) 21 to 23 years of age. The doctorship degree is usually obtained when 21 or 22. The risk of granting fellowship is too great, as the scientific interest in research may be fitful.
- II) 24 to 28 years of age. Frequently this is the best age, if the candidate has given proof that in the years immediately after doctorship he has continued scientific research, obtaining from entering into business or journalistic life or solicitor or barrister offices. Fellows incur the risk, in coming back home, of not obtaining immediately an academic position. Apart from transient circumstances, about which we had some talk, this risk is unavoidable. The average age of entering as associate professors (call them "extraordinary" or "not stable" professor) in Italian Universities has always been high. I do not think it was never very much less than 30 years. In the meantime, young scholars struggle on as best as they can: as chargé de cours, private docents, professors in secondary schools etc.
- III) 28 to 35 years of age. This would be the better period, because scholars may be deemed to have obtained a position and usually they are, not too tied by family duties. On the other hand, the young professor is very interested during these very years in remaining in Italy, because it is by entertaining personal relations, by keeping a careful watch on vacant places he may get a good university. Central and north of Italy Universities are more desirable than islands, southern or out-of-way cities. How, they told me, can we keep in touch with big professor if we go to America?
- IV) 33 to 40 or 45 years of age. Family ties, the growth of sedentary habits are sometimes here the obstacle. In some cases, this would otherwise be a very good age. Scholars have already a definitive position; and sometimes they would be enthusiastic about a period of research in foreign countries, without the worry of lectures, examinations. As we have not the American sabbatical year, a fellowship would be a desirable substitute to it, I have, however, abstained from making recommendation of such men, because I did not feel that they did enter into the scope of the Foundation; and also because the language difficulty would be at that age too great. I have, however, always in mind Professor Ottokar's case. His field of work would be France, Belgium, Holland and the North of Germany cities. He speaks fluently those languages and is a scholar of high standing. I told him that Rockefeller fellowship were not open to him; but, if you feel inclined to consider the matter, I may re-open his case. [...]

Yours sincerely,
Luigi Einaudi

16.

John Van Sickle to Luigi Einaudi

The Rockefeller Foundation
[Paris,] May 23th, 1930

Dear Professor Einaudi:

I have your letter of May 15th with your two recommendations. They impress me very favorably and I shall submit them to the officers at the next meeting, which should be early next month.

I have read with interest your general remarks regarding age and the problem of selection. Perhaps I have slightly over-emphasized the importance of academic positions for returned Fellows. In general, this is our preference, but we do recognize that there are certain positions outside the academic fold to which ex-fellows may profitably go. In this category we might consider research positions in national banks or in public offices. Such cases should be regarded as exceptions, however. It is not quite clear to me why brilliant young men who have gone into business or journalism or barristers' offices would seem debarred from consideration. The important considerations in such cases would seem to be two: (1) Have the candidates maintained their scientific interest during this period as evidenced by publications in representative scientific journals; (2) To what positions would they return at the expiration of the fellowship. We have just passed some German candidates who have been for a number of years in such positions as the above and have brilliantly demonstrated their continuing interest in scientific problems. Finally, in view of the special situation in Italy, I think the officers here would be disposed to stretch the age limit slightly in favor of a candidate where all the evidence was satisfactory. Professor Ottocar's request has been considered very carefully here and in New York and it has been decided that it cannot be supported at the present time. We all hope that he may find some other means of carrying out his interesting researches.

I am returning the memorandum you sent us regarding Professor Ottocar.

Yours very sincerely,
John Van Sickle

17.

John Van Sickle to Luigi Einaudi

The Rockefeller Foundation
Paris, March 18, 1931.

Dear Dr. Einaudi:

I am requesting our librarian to send you the 1929 report of the Foundation: you should receive it in a few days. The 1930 report will not appear for some months yet.

You may be interested in an entry I have made in my diary covering the case of Dr. Leo Ferrero. Will you let me know if I have correctly reported our conversation?

“LF has done some good work in social psychology but JVS gets the impression that he is more of a *littérateur* than a serious scholar. However the information is inadequate. JVS thought that since LF wanted a fellowship for study in France, where he has been working for several years, this would be a good reason for refusing to recommend him. JVS drew E’s attention to the proposed Yale seminar upon the impact of culture upon personality, and asked whether LF might not be a good candidate.”

It may interest you to know that on the evening of the day of my pleasant luncheon with you and Mrs Einaudi, Mrs. Van Sickle went to the hospital where she presented us with a very fine boy. Both mother and son are doing excellently and will soon be at home where they hope to have the pleasure of entertaining you the next time you come to Paris.

Yours sincerely,
John Van Sickle

18.

Luigi Einaudi to John Van Sickle

[Turin,] March 21, 1931

Dear Mr Van Sickle:

Your report of the conversation relating to the case of Dr Leo Ferrero is correct indeed. I wish only to add that while my impression is that at present there is in his writings more literature than scholarship, there are at the same time indexes that, as he is a young man, the existing scholarship’s germs, can be made to fructify in due time.

As it is expedient that Mr Mario de Bernardi (via Amedeo Avogadro 16, Turin) should begin as soon as possible the procedure for obtaining his passports and as it is necessary to justify the reasons for studying in foreign countries, I shall be glad if you can send him the certificates of appointment to the fellowship (four copies as usual).

Mrs Einaudi joins me in presenting to Mrs Van Sickle and to you her best congratulations and wishes upon the birth of the son whom you desired so much. May I add that we hope to see both you and Mrs Van Sickle at our country house next autumn?

Your extremely kind hospitality in Paris and that of Mr Gunn and Mr Kittredge is remembered with great pleasure.

Yours sincerely,
Luigi Einaudi

19.

Luigi Einaudi to John Van Sickle

[Turin,] September 24, 1932

Dear Mr Van Sickle:

Mr Kittredge writes me about the Foundation's present study and appraisal of the Fellowship program in order to determine its future policy in its regard, asking me to send you my impressions of its results as far as Italy is concerned. I have gone through my Italian experience, and I think to be able to offer to you to following observations:

- all Fellows have gained from their study in the United States and in Europe the invaluable benefit of a not superficial outlook on university and social life of countries different from the native one;
- the prolonged connection with American and foreign European professors has given them a direct knowledge of methods of work very often different from the methods followed in their country of origin;
- on their coming back to Italy, in case of signori D'Entrèves (appointed 1926-1928), Einaudi (1927-29), Vanoni (1928-1930), Fubini (1929-1930), and Breglia (1929-1930), the Rockefeller Fellowship has been given by the public university commissions a marked consideration when they applied for the degrees of private-docentship in Italian universities (D'Entrèves, Einaudi, Fubini, Breglia), or for a position as chargé-de-cours (D'Entrèves, Vanoni, Fubini), which Congress or positions were granted to them;
- the same may be said for signor Martinenghi when he applied for a directive place in the research office firstly of the General Confederation of Industry and then of the great Pirelli Co., and for signor Gerbi when he was appointed director of the research office of the Banca Commerciale Italiana. No doubt signor Pagni, when coming back to Italy, will be able to start again on his work at the General Confederation of Industry with enhanced prospects of career owing to his field researches in the United States, made on these very topics (relations between employers and employees) in which he previously worked. May I add that the Rockefeller Fellowships plan has a great chance of being fruitful not only in the academic field, but also in the intermediate territory midway science and business, to the effect of permeating business and administration also with a scientific background and with a knowledge of foreign problems and methods;
- signori Moratti, Travaglini, Ascoli and Da Empoli were already chargés de cours or private docents in some university, and signor De Maria already extraordinary professor, before sailing for the United States. The time spent over there shall certainly further their academic career;
- the reports which I have received from signori De Bernardi and Boccassino make me feel sure that their Fellowship time is fully utilized to the best effects;
- I regret to be unable to offer definitive conclusions about the work done by signori Gatti, De Simone and Rota Sperti. I know, however, that signor Rota

- Sperti, when working at the International Labor Office at Geneva, for the Ford enquiry on real wages, was highly appreciated by the officers in charge of this special work;
- finally, I wish to add that perhaps the best characteristic of the Rockefeller Fellowships plan is its flexibility. No rule-of-thumb regulations, no public competitions with oral or written examinations, no fixed acquirement about degrees, printed publications and so on. It is difficult to tell the result of regulations. In the Rockefeller flexible plan mistakes may sometimes occur, but the selection is free from written words and these can not be made the easy screen to exempt from the personal acquaintance with candidates and behind which to conceal the personal responsibility of those making the selection.

Yours sincerely,
Luigi Einaudi

MAX MASON

20.

Max Mason to Luigi Einaudi⁶

The Rockefeller Foundation
New York, May 21, 1931

Dear Dr. Einaudi:

I am writing to you at this time to let you know of changes in the system of administering the Foundation's fellowship program in the social science. These changes are the result of discussions among the New York officers. They are expected to take place at the end of the present calendar year, and will involve the abandonment of the present system of Fellowship Advisers in the various European countries.

When the Rockefeller Foundation took over social science fellowship program of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in January, 1929, it seemed best to continue the methods of administration which the Memorial had previously developed. These method had worked most satisfactorily. Under the Memorial's organization no other procedure could have been expected to work as well, since the Memorial never undertook to organize a foreign staff of its own. No change was contemplated at the time of the reorganization of the Boards.

The reorganization, however, affected the situation in two important respects: it resulted in the development of a full staff for the social sciences in Paris, and it brought the social science fellowship program into intimate association with the

⁶ TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Max Mason.

programs prevailing in the divisions of medicine and the natural sciences. As you know, these divisions maintain in Paris one or two men specifically charged with the selection and recommendation of candidates. In making their recommendation they seek the advice of eminent scholars in the candidates' special fields. This system has given full satisfaction. Naturally, therefore, there has developed the conviction that it is inadvisable to maintain two different systems for administering what is in effect a single and comprehensive program.

We are consequently letting you know at this time that the former arrangements under which we have been having the advantage of your services will be brought to a close at the end of the present calendar year. We hope, however, that this change in the administrative arrangements for the selection of fellows will not deprive us of the benefit of your counsel and advice in matters affecting the social sciences in your country. I know that in the matter of fellowships Mr. Van Sickle will certainly want to confer with you regarding procedures to be followed in the future in selecting candidates.

May I add that we all view the change with mixed feelings. The Foundation is under a deep debt of gratitude to you for bringing to its attention a remarkably fine group of young scholars. The standards which you have maintained in the selection of your nominees have established a tradition which must be as great a source of satisfaction to you as it has been to the Foundation. Mr. Day has particularly appreciated the privilege of working with you in the past, and hopes that he may have the pleasure of seeing you from time to time as opportunity may offer, either in Europe or New York. With cordial regards,

Sincerely yours,
Max Mason

21.

Italian Former Fellows to Max Mason⁷

[August 1st] 1931

Dear Mr. President:

Rumors have reached us of proposed changes in the future administration of the social sciences fellowship program of the Foundation. It is said that the present system of advisors in the several European countries will be discontinued; and that the selection of Fellows will be entrusted to a group of Foundation's officers, whose duty it will be to travel around the various countries, see the candidates and recommend appointments thereafter.

We, as past and present Fellows in the social sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation, having naturally the greatest interest in the maintenance of the standards hitherto established in the selection of Fellows, view with apprehen-

⁷ RAC, RG 1.2 100 ES box 49 folder 376.

sion and regret such a far-reaching change in the policy, and should therefore wish to lay before you in a spirit of cooperation and in response to the frequent requests of the Foundation to make observations and proposals as to the organisation of the fellowships, a few of the reasons which have prompted us to take this initiative.

1. We submit that among the great number of applicants (a number which we believe is bound to increase under the proposed system) it would be impossible to make a good choice for anybody, who does not know their relative value, who has not followed them in their past academic work, who has not tested their capacities for real and earnest study. More difficult still to make a choice for anybody who is not in a position to check the real value of the people who will be making haphazard introduction of candidates whom the scarcely know. Given the elusive character of the social sciences, which escape the more exact controls of the natural and medical sciences, we feel that only advisors of the same country of origin of the candidates can ever satisfactorily make up their minds as to the best available people.

2. We wish to emphasize that under the proposed system it will not be possible still to rely upon the serious advice of former advisors or of anybody else, first because no opinion upon the advisability of nominating anybody is possible without at the same time passing a comparative judgement upon all applicants, which nobody would be any longer in a position to do; secondly because no sound advice is thinkable without at the same time assuming full responsibility therefore.

3. We think that a difficulty of a more general character would confront the Foundation's officers in the shape of those too frequent academic rivalries unknown to the outside world, and which – owing to the lack of independent advisors – might lead to misunderstandings and might involve the Foundation in awkward and critical situation, much to the damage of its prestige.

4. We should like to stress the disquieting position which would undoubtedly confront the Foundation's officials in these European countries where, given the present peculiar political conditions, they would in the absence of an independent advisor, be inevitably drawn near those official quarters whose suggestions and influences would almost certainly run counter to the veritable interests of the science.

5. Finally, given the growing number of Fellows studying in European countries, we consider the presence of advisors in the various countries to be absolutely necessary. It is the duty of the advisor and not that of the persons to whom the Fellows may chance to be introduced, to help the Fellows with letters of introduction to the specialists working their respective fields, with information as to professors, academic and social life of the country, as to those other "imponderabilia", upon which depends the success of a fellowship in the natural science where, in a sense, laboratory work is sufficient.

We trust to have proved the case against a change in the present system and to have demonstrated (a) the impossibility on the part of outsiders of a good choice

of Fellows (points 1 to 4), (b) the importance of the help of advisors to Fellows in the several countries (point 5).

We are sure that frank expression of our opinion will be welcomed by the Foundation, as a sign of unfailing interest in its work on the part of those who have had and have the privilege of a Rockefeller Fellowship, and since it has been prompted only by the fear of seeing the fine traditions of that Foundation jeopardized whose fortunes are uppermost in the thoughts of all and every one of us.

Breglia, Passerin d'Entrèves, Mario Einaudi, Fubini,
Martinenghi, Rosenstein Rodan, Rota-Sperti, Vanoni

SELKSAR GUNN

22.

Selksar Gunn to Edmund E. Day⁸

The Rockefeller Foundation
Cadiz, December 31st, 1931

Dear Rufus:

Here we are at the end of the year, and this is a good time for stocktaking.

As I see it, our work in the social sciences in Europe is in a fairly healthy condition. We are getting pretty well known, and so far have not got into any difficulties. I look for a period of development, and it may be fairly rapid, not that we are in any particular hurry but the very subjects we are dealing with are of increasing interest, and a rapid evolution is to be anticipated in the next few years. The Natural and Medical Sciences will continue more or less in the future as they have in the past, but the Social Sciences are, unless my forecast is quite mistaken, in for a boom. This is in part due to our own fellowship program. The analysis of our past fellows, their records and present positions, will reveal, I believe, that despite certain weaknesses, particularly in France and Italy, we have a considerable group of youngish men of more than average ability, and from which will be recruited many of the real leaders of the future. Our abandonment of the advisor system is all to the good. We are hopeful that we can recruit a better lot of fellows from France. My conversations with Cavalier, the Director of Higher Education of France, lead me to believe that we are on the threshold of overcoming some of the difficulties which have made the picking of first-class Frenchman so complicated. I particularly hope that we may be able to find capable men in several countries to whom fellowships could be given for study in research in International Relations. Here is a real opportunity with great possibilities. Such men would pro-

⁸ RAC RG 2 General Correspondence 1931 700 S box 63, folder 516.

bably be granted fellowships for work in other European countries rather than in the United States. Our fellowship program in general must remain the backbone of our European efforts.

I have written you concerning resident fellowships. I reiterate my belief that this is of prime importance.

Italy, from the point of view of the SS <Social Sciences>, is practically off the map for the time being, and the difficulties arising from the Yugoslav government in refusing leaves of absence or visas to certain fellows may also rule out that country from our program. [...] Well, this letter, long as it is, naturally is incomplete. I raise certain questions and queries. I think it fair to say that we are constantly mulling things over in our mind and feel that we have a serious responsibility.

Let's hope that 1932 will be a better year for this sick world, a greater opportunity for us in our work, and a happy and prosperous one for our friends and ourselves.

Yours very sincerely,
S.M.G.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS BETWEEN
LUIGI EINAUDI AND LUIGI DE SIMONE, PIETRO ROTA-SPERTI,
ALESSANDRO GATTI, ANTONELLO GERBI, LEO FERRERO

LUIGI DE SIMONE

1.

Luigi De Simone to Luigi Einaudi¹

Cambridge-Mass., 14 marzo 1928

Illustre professore,

eccomi a Lei e voglia ritenere che non per dimenticanza comincio solo ora a scriverle del mio soggiorno americano. Anzi, ebbi motivo di parlare di Lei più frequentemente di quel che si può immaginare e con Seligman, Fisher, Schumpeter, Mitchell e altri insigni studiosi; sempre ne riportai la gradita impressione che Ella è qui circondata da largo apprezzamento e da dovuta stima.

E se finalmente mi decido a scriverle, la ragione sta nel proposito che ebbi di lasciare che la mia mente si calmasse e si preparasse a maggiore serenità di giudizio su uomini e cose di questo grande paese. Il vero è che noi siamo abituati a certi limiti e qui lo spirito umano, viene, a prima vista, sopraffatto dalla fusione, tutt'altro che fantastica, di tutte le immensità!

Si arriva da un continente di povertà e depressione materiale e si prova un senso di fastidio così accentuato da rendere opprimente la stessa prosperità americana. Quel che sovra ogni cosa colpisce è la netta antitesi al nostro modo di vedere il mondo materiale e alla nostra concezione di vita.

Da noi, la stabilità ereditaria: qui una carovana ininterrotta, pervasa dal bisogno di realizzazione immediata; noi siamo attaccati ad una storia e questa gente è senza storia; da noi, l'esistenza di una fortuna media e frammentaria alimenta la convinzione dell'immutabilità delle cose e qui il desiderio attivo di progresso è suggerito, anche imposto, dall'insicurezza ed ineguaglianza di condizione. Carat-

¹ The letters number 1-2 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Luigi De Simone.

teristiche tutte di alto interesse per chi indaga ma che servono pure a svelare quale disparità di grado, di temperamento, di abito mentale sia tra noi e gli americani, nonostante indurrebbe a negarla e l'identico valore della razza e il comune modo di sentire. E si può comprendere donde sorgono gli ostacoli ad una reciproca e più intima conoscenza!

A mio avviso, uno dei frutti più cospicui, di cui sarà feconda l'opera del "Memorial" è da porsi nella penetrazione vasta ed efficace che giovani europei vanno conducendo attraverso una realtà vivente per concretezza ed attualità. Il loro sforzo giornaliero, critico epperò chiarificatore, di rendersi esatto conto dello spettacolo appassionato e spesso "astonishing" di un popolo in formazione, permette si dissolvano vecchie incrostazioni di pensiero e ne prendano subito il posto esperienze più ricche e valutazioni meno vaghe ed insicure.

Io sento che la mia permanenza a Londra aveva slargato il mio pensiero e lo aveva influenzato al punto di farmi riconoscere un continentale, con alcune punte anti-inglesi. Ma qui, fin dai primi contatti con le più semplici e anche più tipiche manifestazioni di questa civiltà, si acquista immediata la coscienza di quel che significhi l'Europa, nella sua unità spirituale, con tutto il peso della sua tradizione, della sua cultura, della sua storia. E si vorrebbero sparite per incanto discordie e quisquiglie che ne arroventano la vita ed operano con incoerenza e sragionevolezza inesplicabili. Il che fa tanto più acuta la nostalgia di starne lontano in chi, per la parte che gli spetta, vorrebbe concorrere e non può vedere indirizzati gli avvenimenti secondo la sua brama e se ne matura la conclusione.

A questo punto, mi avvedo che ho sottratto troppo tempo alle sue occupazioni, intrattenendola su considerazioni che si affidano solo alla sua indulgenza. Vi sono scivolato senz'avvedermene e non le ho detto niente della mia attività. Sarà per un'altra lettera: per intanto, si abbia i migliori saluti e creda al devoto ricordo del suo

L. De Simone

2.

Luigi Einaudi to Luigi De Simone

Torino, 16 aprile 1928

Caro De Simone,

Rispondo alla sua gentile lettera del 14 marzo, indirizzando queste linee ancora al Memorial, perché le siano rinviate, non avendo trovato sulla sua lettera l'indirizzo attuale di Cambridge.

Da quanto ella mi scrive ho avuto l'impressione che ella ricevuto come un urto morale nel trovarsi in questo diverso mondo americano. Credo anch'io che non di rado gli europei sbarcando negli Stati Uniti abbiano quella stessa sua impressione di fastidio di fronte ad una così grande prosperità economica. Ma d'altro canto quel rapido viaggio che io ho fatto negli Stati Uniti mi aveva da questo punto

di vista assai più interessato che infastidito. Discorrendo con <un> americano, e cercando di farmi un'idea delle ragioni di questa loro grande prosperità, io mi ero persuaso, e conservo ancora adesso questa persuasione, che le cause di esso non fossero prevalentemente materiali, ma consistessero in una più elevata concezione della vita, di quanto sia comune nell'Europa, specialmente continentale. Proprio il rovescio della opinione comune. La regione nella quale si trova attualmente della Nuova Inghilterra mi pare tipica al riguardo, come quella che non deve certamente la sua ricchezza attuale a favorevoli condizioni della terra, o delle miniere o di altre ricchezze naturali. Forse per vedere con occhio più simpatico il paese nel quale temporaneamente lei si trova, bisognerebbe che lei non sentisse tanto come lei mi scrive nella sua lettera, la nostalgia di chi sta lontano da qui. Si tratta di una parentesi nella vita, e poiché questa esiste, l'essenziale è di trarne il migliore profitto possibile, il che si ottiene facendosi molti amici, e cercando nelle ore libere di interrogarli e di sfruttarli il più possibile. Mi interesserà molto di sapere da qualche sua lettera i giudizi individuali sugli uomini che avrà avuto occasione di conoscere.

Per il lavoro che ella aveva in mente di condurre costi ha trovato opportunità di materiale?

Mi abbia coi più cordiali saluti,

Luigi Einaudi

PIETRO ROTA-SPERTI

3.

Luigi Einaudi to Pietro Rota-Sperti²

Torino, 25 aprile 1928

Caro Rotasperti,

Assai mi dolsi di sentire che la mia lettera ultima non le era arrivata; non ricordo precisamente quale ne fosse il contenuto, ma probabilmente essa rispondeva all'altra sua precedente, in cui ella mi chiedeva consigli per la sua futura carriera. L'avviso che le esprimevo era quello che nelle sue circostanze, tenuto conto anche della sua età, non le convenisse di prorogare inutilmente il periodo di semplice aspettativa e di studio. Ella certamente da questo periodo di studio ha potuto ricavare frutti molto utili, ed una conoscenza del mondo americano che le riuscirà in ogni caso di vantaggio. Ma ad un certo punto è necessario decidersi a scegliere una via, ed il prorogare una decisione può poi essere in avvenire più di danno che di vantaggio.

Questo era il mio avviso quando le scrivevo. Una lettera ricevuta da Mr. Day mi fece sapere che ella era stato in ufficio della Fondazione, ed ivi aveva manifestato

² TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Pietro Rota-Sperti.

l'impressione che per ragioni complesse sue personali ella non riteneva opportuno o possibile di ritornare in Italia, e che le avrebbe giovato meglio una occupazione in Germania. Io non posso entrare in questi che sono particolari di carattere tutt'affatto personale, ma, se dovessi esprimere una opinione, sarebbe questa, che sia stato inutile di esporre questa difficoltà o questi intendimenti alla Fondazione; potrebbero nascerne preoccupazioni ingiustificate per l'avvenire, con danno di altri giovani, rispetto ai quali, come ella sa, entra in vigore la disposizione del nuovo bollettino, che richiede un impegno morale di ritornare in patria, ed ivi proseguire la propria carriera, ed io reputo che questo impegno di carattere morale sia per l'avvenire da osservarsi nel modo più scrupoloso, ed ogni mia cura è rivolta a scegliere solo giovani i quali abbiano la ferma intenzione di utilizzare in patria le esperienze e gli esperimenti usufruiti durante il periodo della borsa all'estero. Del resto io ho l'impressione che anche per lei non esista alcuna ragione perché ella non possa svolgere qui una proficua attività. Dati i suoi particolari studi, forse le sarebbe conveniente di vedere presso la sede newyorkese di qualche istituto di credito italiano se sia possibile di ottenere un posto che le permetta di passare parte del suo tempo qui, e parte all'estero, così da utilizzare la perfetta conoscenza dell'inglese che ha, a vantaggio dello sviluppo degli affari italiani all'estero. Coi più cordiali saluti, mi abbia

Luigi Einaudi

ALESSANDRO GATTI

4.

Alessandro Gatti to Edmund E. Day³

5442 Harper Ave
Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1929

My dear Mr. Day:

I thank you for your letter of May 6. This letter contains the refusal to extend my fellowship for a third year. The ground of this refusal is given as follows: "I have to call your attention to page 3, paragraph 3, of the Bulletin of Information which says, 'In very exceptional cases a third year may be granted'. I am sorry to report that a careful review of your case as stated by yourself and as ascertained from your references, does not lead us to think that your circumstances are to be regarded as exceptional".

In your letter of May 6 it is said also that you carefully reviewed my case, as "stated by myself and as ascertained from my references". In my application I mentioned references from several professors to whom I had written asking them to send you their opinions on my work, I am positively sure that most of these

³ TFL, *Documents. 3 Non Bio*, 1929, f. Alessandro Gatti.

references could not reach you before May 6. Therefore you ascertained my case from some of my references, not from all of them.

Apart from the above mentioned objection I do most emphatically protest against the ambiguity of your letter. Your letter leaves the door open to the most extraordinary doubts. I have to justify your refusal not only for myself, but for those outstanding people who know me and my scientific career. You realise that the refusal of a third year fellowship, coming as it does, from an eminently scientific Foundation like the Rockefeller Foundation, means in plain words either that my record in the previous two years is a bad one or that the researches as outlined by me are not worth being carried forward. At any rate it means that a highly scientific body judged my work as worthless and my scientific efficiency very poor. Your letter as it is, if read by supporters (I should be compelled to send them a copy of it to justify your refusal) means a severe handicap to my whole scientific career. You will understand that I can not rely upon the possibility that my fellow-scientists might judge a scientific body like the Rockefeller Foundation to be incompetent to judge scientific work. Since I trust you realise that you are dealing with people who have achieved positive results in Sciences, acquiring an established reputation as promising scientists, I am sure that you will understand that your letter is not becoming to the relationships which should rule the intercourse between a scientific body and a scientists.

I am entitled to an explanation from the Rockefeller Foundation, first, as to the judgement given upon my record for the previous years; secondly, as to the standard by which you reached the conclusion that my researches are not worth pursuing in a third year fellowship. Until you send me such explanation, I do not feel I shall consider your refusal final.

For all the above mentioned motives, I trust you will oblige me in re-considering my case.

Alessandro Gatti

5.

Luigi Einaudi to Alessandro Gatti⁴

[Torino,] 3 giugno 1929

Caro dottor Gatti,

ho ricevuto dalla Fondazione copia di una lettera in data 10 maggio 1929, da lei indirizzata al sig. Day, e della risposta che il sig. Day le mandò l'11 maggio.

Io ho risposto in una lettera al sig. Day:

“Mi rincresce assai che sia stata scritta la lettera del Dr. Gatti, ed io credo essa sia stata, come voi giustamente dite, soltanto originata da una meno esatta interpretazione del bollettino di informazione e della decisione della Fondazione”.

⁴ The letters number 5-6 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Alessandro Gatti.

Al sig. Day mi sono limitato a scrivere queste parole, ma in verità mi corre obbligo di dirle che secondo la mia opinione la interpretazione da lei data al rifiuto della borsa per il III° anno è veramente inconcepibile. Il bollettino di informazione parla molto chiaramente, ed è di tutta evidenza che il rifiuto non può avere per nessuno il significato assolutamente fuori di luogo che ella ha voluto dargli. Se un qualunque corpo scientifico dopo avere dato ad uno scienziato per una volta un premio, non lo dà per la seconda, ciò non vuole affatto dire che giudichi privo di valore il lavoro compiuto da quello scienziato: può avere tantissimi significati, tutti, all'infuori di questo.

La Fondazione, come qualunque altro corpo scientifico, deve essere perfettamente libera di destinare premi o borse di volta in volta a chi giudica più opportuno.

La sua lettera non doveva essere scritta anche perché, mi rincresce di doverlo dire, può gettare una cattiva luce sui fellows italiani, e far considerare poco opportuno di continuare ad accogliere con quella larghezza, che finora la Fondazione ha dimostrato, le proposte che in avvenire potessero essere fatte a favore di giovani studiosi suoi connazionali.

Mi abbia coi migliori saluti suo
Luigi Einaudi

6.

Alessandro Gatti to Luigi Einaudi

Madison, Win. 22 VI-1929

Chiarissimo Signor Professore,

in risposta alla Sua lettera del 3 c. m. noto che la risposta da me inviata al Signor Day, ha incontrato la Sua disapprovazione. Il Signor Day tuttavia non soltanto non attese le lettere di chiarimento alla mia domanda per decidere sul caso mio, ma non tenne conto nella sua lettera di rifiuto di quel paragrafo del Bollettino, per il quale estensioni di borse di studio sono condizionali ad un buon rapporto dei primi due anni. Se la lettera del Signor Day avesse contenuto l'espressione, che non ostante il buon rapporto dei primi due anni della borsa, la Fondazione non riteneva che le circostanze del mio caso fossero tali da consentire l'estensione della borsa, la mia risposta non sarebbe stata giustificata. Non è certo la mia lettera che può gettare cattiva luce sui futuri e presenti Italiani, che godono la borsa di studio, come Ella crede, tant'è che il signor Day non ne fece cenno alcuno nella ulteriore corrispondenza con me.

Potrebbe forse gettare cattiva luce il fatto che si sia fatta, per mancanza di previ accordi una domanda collettiva per l'estensione della borsa, personalmente e non attraverso il tramite Suo, come forse sarebbe stato più opportuno; cosa che a suo tempo avevo pensato di suggerire.

La mia lettera pertanto non scemerà la larghezza con la quale la borsa di studio sarà distribuita ad Italiani.

Credo opportuno comunicare alla Fondazione che ho ricevuto la Sua disapprovazione, così, pro bono pacis, ogni equivoco sarà sciolto. Con ossequii.

Suo dev. mo
Alessandro Gatti

ANTONELLO GERBI

7.

Antonello Gerbi to Luigi Einaudi

London, July 10th 1930

Caro e Illustre Senatore,

spero a suo tempo avrà ricevuto le notizie sull'opuscolo di Cavour. Qui le allego copia del rapporto interinale che ho mandato a Parigi. Ho spedito il plico al dr. Van Sickle, lasciando lui arbitro della tempestività della presentazione. Come vedrà, ho accennato all'America, senza insistere. Se mi chiederanno schiarimenti, svolgerò gli argomenti di dubbio e di desiderio che Lei mi ha suggerito. Per ora, e per non superare il limite di dieci pagine, mi è parso più conveniente non "mettere troppa carne al fuoco". Ma, nella sostanza, mi pare di aver già seguito il Suo consiglio.

Nel Rapporto, Ella non troverà niente, credo, che Ella già non sapesse. Devo dirLe, però, che Mr. Hall, al quale mi son presentato per dargliene copia, mi ha accolto con pochissima cortesia, come se fossi andato a disturbarlo. Mi ha fatto delle osservazioni assolutamente ingiustificate; ha scorso la relazione punteggiandola di risatine sarcastiche; e si è mostrato esageratamente offeso della frase a pag. 7, in cui ha voluto vedere, sia una critica alla sua opera di advisor, sia una critica alla nazione inglese! Ho cercato di spiegargli che la frase era detta evidentemente: a) senza alcun riferimento alle persone nominate nel rapporto, b) come una giustificazione a mio scarico per non aver più fatto conoscenze, e non come un rimprovero a chicchessia. Ma non sono affatto sicuro di aver persuaso Mr. Hall, che, se Ella non lo conosce, è un giovanottino biondo (credo più giovane di me), che non è mai nel suo studio, e di rado guarda in faccia le persone con cui parla; e nemmeno le prega di sedersi.

Le ho riferito l'incidente solo per debito storico di verità.

Gradisca i miei migliori ringraziamenti e deferenti saluti da

Antonello Gerbi

8.

Luigi Einaudi to Antonello Gerbi⁵

[Torino,] 18/07/1930

Caro Gerbi,

Ho ricevuto, quasi subito dopo la sua lettera, una anche dal dottor Van Sickle, il quale mi comunicava la sua domanda di rinnovazione della borsa. Io ho risposto dando il mio parere favorevole, e soggiungendo che a parer mio, come linea di massima, dopo un periodo di vacanza in Italia, ella potrebbe trattenersi fino alla fine di dicembre a Londra e poi andare negli Stati Uniti; ma soggiunsi che mi riservavo di dare in proposito un parere più preciso quando avessi avuto la opportunità di discutere personalmente con lei a fondo del programma americano. In questo modo ritengo di non aver pregiudicato nulla, tanto più che non sarà appunto male di vederci, cosa che si potrà combinare durante il suo mese di permanenza in Italia. Nella mia lettera non ho detto nulla dello stipendio nel mese di intervallo da passarsi in Italia. È un punto intorno al quale non esistono regole definite, qualche volta lo danno quando si allegano ragioni di salute o di famiglia, e per un periodo limitato, mi pare inferiore al mese. Forse se lei ci passa sopra, facendo cominciare il secondo anno dal giorno in cui lascia l'Italia, gioverà a semplificare.

Certamente se io avessi letto il suo rapporto in precedenza, le avrei dato per consiglio di sopprimere tutto il periodo tra la cartella 6 e quella 7, relativo alle impressioni personali inglesi. Tutto ciò che non è certo sia utile a dirsi è bene non dirlo. Per gli eventuali futuri rapporti, io darei meno enfasi a tutto ciò che sono relazioni di carattere politico, di visite a città, riservando tutta l'enfasi alla parte scientifica.

Dalle notizie che ricevo negli Stati Uniti ci devono essere nel personale del Social Sciences Research Council persone simili a Mr. Hall. Ma di ciò parleremo a voce.

Coi più cordiali saluti,
Luigi Einaudi

LEO FERRERO

9.

Leo Ferrero to Luigi Einaudi⁶35 rue Lhomond V^e [Paris], 15 ottobre 1930

Professore (poiché ha scritto che nessun titolo può esserle più caro di questo) mi permetta di ringraziarla dell'accoglienza che ho trovato alla Cascina S. Giacomo prima di partire per la Francia.

⁵ The letters number 7-8 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Antonello Gerbi.

⁶ The letters number 9-10 are stored in: TFL, *Correspondence*. 2, f. Lawrence K. Frank.

Sono molto grato alla Borsa Rockefeller di avermi dato questa occasione di conoscerla personalmente, dopo aver letto i suoi libri. Vedendola mi sono convinto di quello che supponevo e che immaginavo: esser lei uno di quegli uomini che il Destino per fortuna dà al nostro paese perché possano resistere alla volontà di morte di un popolo, che, come Le dicevo, sembra compiacersi di distruggere le proprie elites.

M'è stato molto dolce, prima di lasciare l'Italia per un certo tempo, di parlar con uno di questi uomini e di esserne accolto con tanta benevolenza.

Presenti i miei ossequi rispettosi alla sua signora e mi creda, con tutta la mia ammirazione, suo

Leo Ferrero

10.

Leo Ferrero to Luigi Einaudi

35 rue Lhomond V^e [Paris], s.d. [Spring 1932]

Caro Professore,

Dunque sono stato accettato dalla Rockefeller e partirò il 10 settembre. Mi hanno fatto leggere strani libri di sociologia americana, in cui si fanno delle statistiche dei giovani che prendono parte a un petting party e mi hanno chiesto, tra l'altro, un'autobiografia con analisi psicologica della mia vita interiore in 20 pagine. Tra le cose sensate, mi hanno chiesto di portare una bibliografia dei libri italiani che parlano della cultura e della personalità. Io spero di trovarla a Torino o vicino a Torino al principio di Agosto, quando passerò per poterle parlare di tutto questo; ma non sono sicuro e le sarei molto grato se potesse informarmi e aiutarmi un poco fin da ora. Immagino che la bibliografia sarà considerevole. Il problema della influenza della cultura sulla personalità è tanto più vasto e difficile che si sa male che cosa è la cultura e non si sa affatto che cosa è la personalità. I Buddisti negano persino che ce ne sia una. Insomma sarà molto interessante discutere di tutto questo.

Mi saluti tanto tutti i suoi e mi creda con la mia gratitudine e ammirazione, suo

Leo Ferrero