



Fabulous Ford brothers, Henry (standing), William (seated right), and Benson, pose beneath portraits of father Edsel (left) and grandfather Henry I.

How big are the stakes? The Ford Foundation today has an annual income of about \$100 million and a net worth of almost \$2 billion—all dedicated to discovering and eliminating the basic causes of human problems.

THE FOUNDATION was established in 1936 by Henry and Edsel Ford as an orderly means of contributing family money to charitable interests. At first, its activities were limited, but large gifts of Ford stock to the tax-free Foundation in subsequent years swelled its income and its activities.

In its early years, the Foundation was controlled by the family. "But as its assets increased," says Henry II, "we felt the public interest should be dominant and we sought the leadership of outstanding men of varied backgrounds for our board. I feel their decisions reflect a cumulative wisdom and experience equalled in few other organizations."

Present Foundation activities include, among many others, programs to encourage registration and voting, promote careers in public service, study correctional institutions for juveniles, study adjustment problems of elderly people, aid Hungarian refugee scholars, develop new teaching methods for Americans to learn Oriental languages, and exchange scholars with Asian and Near Eastern nations. The Foundation is also spending more than \$24 million for the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation—to attract more able college students into teaching careers.

Ford philanthropy doesn't stop with the Foundation. A second charity known as the Ford Fund—organized in 1948 "to discharge our obligations as a corporate citizen"—operates in areas closer to the immediate affairs of the Ford Company. For example, between 70 and 80 college scholarships are given each year to children of Ford employees.

The scholarships, available to all employees making \$12,000 a year or less, pay full tuition and four-fifths of the student's living costs at any college he selects for four years. If the college is privately endowed, the Fund also contributes \$500 per year per student to the school. Hundreds of talented young people have used these Ford scholarships to launch careers in which they will contribute much to their fellow countrymen.

In 1956 the Ford Motor Company gave Henry Ford's fabled home, Fair-

(Continued on page 9)

fortunate aftermath of corporate giving: the boycotting of products by vocal minorities. That sort of thing, unhappily, acts as a considerable deterrent among people and corporations who have much to give.

In the case of the Fords, such feelings is unfair on two counts. First, the Ford Foundation cannot directly control the activities to which it contributes. It must assess the aims, needs, and leadership of such programs, and then expect that these things will be carried through. Usually they are—in a way that brings great credit to the foresight of the Foundation. Sometimes they aren't—or are badly misunderstood—and the Foundation reaps criticism.

The announcement, for example, that the Foundation had allocated \$250,000 to the American Council of Learned Studies for the study of a

language called Telugu inspired all sorts of heavy-handed scorn—from people who didn't know or didn't bother to find out that Telugu is the language spoken by more than 30 million people in a very sensitive part of India and Indo-China. This is an area in which the Russians are making political hay, partly because they know the language.

Secondly, the Ford family and the Ford Company have no control over the activities of the Ford Foundation. Henry and Benson have individual voices on the Foundation's 15-man board of trustees which ultimately rules on the projects undertaken by the Foundation; but the Fords have no special influence or power of veto. Neither of these factors, however, prevented hundreds of gas-station operators from once refusing to service Ford automobiles because they

didn't approve of an activity to which the Foundation contributed.

"A company entering public affairs always runs the risk of offending customers," says Benson philosophically. "We have to sell our products to all kinds of people. But I guess corporations are going to have to live with this problem if they expand their usefulness in outside activities."

This conflicting allegiance—to stockholders, employees, and customers on the one hand and to the community, state, nation, and the world on the other—is a vexing problem. Only increased public understanding of the problem and recognition that the private giving of corporations and corporate officials should be separated from the products they manufacture can guarantee that we will receive the greatest possible good from these financial and intellectual resources.