

# The Rockefeller Foundation and Agricultural Development in Colombia's Cauca Valley, 1940-1980

*By Timothy W. Lorek*

*Department of History, Yale University*



© 2016 by Timothy Lorek



*Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission, but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent. Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is an ongoing publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) under the general direction of James Allen Smith, Vice President of the RAC and Director of Research and Education. Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the RAC. These reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, most of whom have received grants-in-aid from the Archive Center to support their research. The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and not of the Rockefeller Archive Center.*

The International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) opened with Rockefeller, Ford, and Kellogg Foundation support in the 1960s, replacing the Palmira Agricultural Experiment Station, launched with domestic funding in 1927, as the agronomical engine of research and development for Colombia's Cauca Valley. The Palmira station, at its inception, sought to facilitate and distribute new varietal seeds of food, sugar, and fiber crops while promoting more productive breeds of cattle. Later, CIAT, emerging in the 1960s at the height of the Green Revolution and concerns for feeding a growing local and global population, advanced further specialization and genetic crossing and hybridization of corn, rice, yuca, and livestock. As a result of these institutions, agricultural development in the Cauca Valley drew increasingly international attention and the region became an important laboratory in the spread of genetic improvement from Latin America to Asia. Before becoming a key node in a global network of tropical agronomy, however, CIAT built upon the earlier work of the Palmira station, exemplifying how the individuals and institutions that collaborated to produce the Green Revolution relied on regions with existing traditions and infrastructures for agricultural development. Rather than view the Green Revolution as a sudden and dramatic change orchestrated from without, I posit that we should take a longer and more localized view, one that fully considers the regional histories and tensions that provided the foundations for a global movement.

Yet, despite decades of provincial, national, and international investment in agricultural research and development, industrial-scale sugarcane, *not* improved varieties of sustenance crops, emerged in this period as the Cauca Valley's tropical monocrop par excellence. In the 1950s and 60s, as agricultural science experimentation in the Cauca Valley became increasingly international and diverse in pursuit of feeding the masses, the physical land surrounding the research centers became ever more devoted to a singular, specialty crop with little nutritional value produced by large agribusiness. If, as I argue, the Cauca Valley was pivotal in the emergence of a global Green Revolution, how can we account

for the historical presence of a well-funded international research site designed to increase staple food production but surrounded by vast sugarcane-producing enterprises?

Between 1920 and 1980, sometimes competing and sometimes collaborating cultures of agriculture, brought to the Cauca Valley in the agrarian heritages of the various domestic and international exponents of development, envisioned and negotiated new agricultural landscapes in the context of broader processes including the Cold War and the Green Revolution. This was not just a one-directional flow of knowledge, but a network of negotiation and dialogue. Yet, as the spread of industrial-scale sugarcane indicates, local realities did not always meet the various intentions or expectations of the so-called experts from Colombia, the United States, Puerto Rico, or elsewhere. How did experts and specialists from inside and outside of Colombia understand the state of Cauca Valley agriculture and how did they envision its future? How did the resulting development projects relate to the conditions and desires of local inhabitants, whether elite landowners, entrepreneurs, or struggling subsistence farmers? How did the development schemes pursued in the Cauca Valley change over time? What can the Cauca Valley, as a case study, teach us about the global Green Revolution or about the role of agriculture in the Cold War? Landscapes change over time, they have histories. Can we read Latin America's long and violent Cold War or Colombia's enduring struggle over access to fertile land in the paradoxical agrarian landscapes of the Cauca Valley, wherein CIAT is an island in a sea of sugarcane? My dissertation at Yale University pursues these questions through a multi-archival analysis of agricultural development efforts in the Cauca Valley between 1920 and 1980. The Rockefeller Archive Center, through a generous grant-in-aid, facilitated my research in their collections to enhance my understanding of the Rockefeller Foundation's (RF) particular involvement in the Cauca Valley after 1950 through the Colombia Agriculture Program. More broadly, I was able to piece together the RF's work in Colombia as part of a growing global campaign for developing agricultural science and technology.<sup>1</sup>

The Rockefeller Foundation began its efforts in Colombia in medical education and disease control. In 1919, the RF worked on hookworm, in 1923 yellow fever, and in 1927 malaria, in collaboration with surveys and reports at the National University.<sup>2</sup> Following on the heels of the Foundation's experimental work in the Mexico Agricultural Program, the RF began provisioning appropriations for a Colombian Agricultural Program in 1950 with an initial designation of \$40,000.<sup>3</sup> Significantly, the Colombian Agricultural Program comprised the RF's first expansion of its international agricultural development efforts from their origins in Mexico. In Colombia, the Foundation began the process of testing the applicability of its Mexican model of research and collaboration to other countries and the feasibility of its international dissemination.

Much of the decision to open an agricultural program in Colombia could be attributed to the recommendations of Harry M. Miller. Miller initially toured Colombia on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation as part of an extensive Latin American travel itinerary in the 1940s. Miller was a "carte blanche" for Warren Weaver and the Rockefeller Foundation. As the RF efforts in Europe closed during World War II, Miller was granted five years to get acquainted with Latin America and report back to the Rockefeller Foundation on the possibility of establishing a natural sciences program there.<sup>4</sup> In 1941, he impressed the RF with his descriptions of the already well-established agricultural work carried out in Colombia's two agriculture schools in Medellin and Palmira.<sup>5</sup> On another trip, in 1948, he reported the growing enthusiasm of the Colombian government for the new work being done in Mexico, by that time under operation as the Mexican Agricultural Program with its principal RF field office in Chapingo.<sup>6</sup>

On the request of the Colombian Ambassador to the United States, the Rockefeller Foundation then sent Richard Bradfield and Paul C. Mangelsdorf to Colombia to report on the feasibility of extending a Mexico-style program to that

country. The botanists traveled the countryside, including the Cauca Valley, where they visited the site of the Palmira Agricultural Experiment Station. The Cauca Valley, they noted, “has been rated as one of the richest agricultural valleys in the world by students of Colombia since the time of Baron A. von Humboldt.” Yet only ten percent of this rich valley was then under cultivation.<sup>7</sup> This paradox struck Bradfield and Mangelsdorf as representative of Colombia more broadly, where agricultural potential remained far from realized. Owing to this great potential and to the country’s geo-politically strategic site close to the Panama Canal and the United States, the botanists recommended that the RF expand its agricultural operations to accompany a Colombian program.<sup>8</sup>

Unlike in Mexico, however, Bradfield and Mangelsdorf recommended that the Foundation proceed in Colombia by working with existing domestic institutions, such as the Palmira station, already producing agricultural development specialists and research in agronomy. By assigning North American scientists to a particular Colombian institution, rather than congregating them in a central headquarters as in Mexico, the RF would be taking advantage of Colombia’s comparatively precocious infrastructure for scientific advancement. A RF scientist in Colombia would succeed not by producing his own accomplishments, “but by the extent to which he ‘activates’ Colombian specialists into doing effective research.” RF funds would be best used, they explained, “only when the effects of each American specialist are multiplied manyfold through the labors of native specialists stimulated and inspired by sympathetic foreign personnel.”<sup>9</sup>

The Cauca Valley, a subtropical river valley of fertile soil in the country’s southwest, had already established itself as an important research center, without the guidance or financial assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation or the United States. In 1928, provincial and federal funds supported the opening of the Palmira Agricultural Experiment Station. “La granja,” as it was affectionately known, was modeled off of US experiment stations, particularly in the cotton, sugar, and rice growing south, where Cauca Valley agronomists and politicians

recognized familiar climatic, horticultural, and labor regimes. The 1928 visit of a Puerto Rican agricultural mission helped lay the foundations for the Palmira station's early agenda. By the time Harry M. Miller and other U.S. specialists such as LSU rural sociologist T. Lynn Smith and University of Florida geographer Raymond Crist arrived in the 1940s, Palmira already had almost two decades of domestically-driven experience with agricultural science and experimentation.<sup>10</sup>

It was not a coincidence, then, that men such as Miller, Bradfield, and Mangelsdorf identified Palmira and the Cauca Valley as a worthwhile location for expanding the RF's agricultural science efforts. With a research center already functioning regionally, RF personnel could hit the ground running and collaborate with local agronomists in growing agricultural science research with an enhanced budget and international attention. A similar situation existed for Bogotá and Medellín, the other two sites at the outset of the RF's Colombian Agricultural Program.

The Colombian program initially drew personnel from the earlier Mexican effort. The first wave of U.S. specialists sent to Colombia came directly from Mexico. These vacated posts in Mexico were then filled largely by Mexicans, under the principal that "the ultimate objective of the Foundation's foreign program is to turn the work over to native technologists as rapidly as possible."<sup>11</sup> This Mexico-Colombia connection followed earlier examples of Rockefeller scholarships and grants to send Colombian students to study agronomy in Mexico.<sup>12</sup> Five years into the official Rockefeller agricultural project in Colombia, the RF Appropriations Committee noted the rapid progress in Colombia and attributed this success to the experience drawn from Mexico. By 1955, the RF's work in Latin American agriculture had essentially become a "single operation." "There is a continuous exchange of personnel, agricultural materials, and information, with resultant mutual benefit. The earlier work in Mexico has enabled more rapid progress in Colombia which, in turn, aided Chile; and Colombia and Mexico have joined to promote more rapid agricultural progress in all of the countries of Central

America.”<sup>13</sup> The expansion and extension of the RF’s agricultural work in Latin America built on the foundational connection established between Mexico and Colombia.

As the Mexican experience led directly to the operation of the RF’s Colombia project, so the Colombian work stimulated the opening of new agricultural field sites in Chile (1955) and India (1956). Personnel from the Colombia project took their knowledge and experience to new assignments around the world. Jerry Grant, the directing geneticist of the Colombian Agriculture Program in 1956, left to take the position of Assistant Field Director of the new Indian Agricultural Program. Grant held this post in India from 1957 to 1960, when he returned to Colombia to continue his work there as Field Director. In 1961, 25 men from the Middle East traveled to Mexico and Colombia with RF support to receive training in wheat improvement. Peter R. Jennings, who led initial rice improvement research in Colombia in 1957, moved on to direct plant pathology and crop protection research at the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines. RF scientists in India mixed maize hybrids from Caribbean lines selected and tested in Colombia with Indian and US varieties.<sup>14</sup> According to D.D. Harpstead in 1964, corn varieties, hybrids, and inbred lines from Colombia were being used in the corn programs of twenty nations, including India. Among 142 new double crosses of corn in India, 82% contained one or more inbred lines from the work of RF staff in the Colombian program.<sup>15</sup>

After the first initial years of the Colombian Agricultural Program, RF representatives reflected upon its steady progress and international influence. “The immediate and successful utilization of plant materials developed in Mexico firmly entrenched the program in Colombia. Subsequently the staff in Colombia in association with their Colombian colleagues have carried the basic food research far beyond this initial phase. The program which began with corn, wheat, and beans now includes projects on barley, potatoes, green manure crops with emphasis on genetic improvement, soil fertility and management, and pest

and disease control.” Despite political turnover, the Colombian governments’ contributions and dedication to the project impressed the Foundation. Both sides of the political conflict, the governments before and after the coup of 1953, requested the program’s expansion, including study of cotton, tobacco, oil crops, cacao, and sugar, all of which the RF initially declined in order to strengthen its focus on grains, legumes, and other staple crops.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, as many RF representatives noted, the perceived success of the Colombian site owed much to the collaborative enthusiasm of the Colombian government. In 1952, Norman Borlaug noted his surprise at such continuing investment in spite of political turmoil. “Never have I seen as good relations between a foreing (sic) research program and a government of the country where it is working,” he wrote, “as that which exists between the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture and the Rockefeller Foundation.”<sup>17</sup>

In 1951, Warren Weaver quoted H.M. Miller’s recommendation that the Colombian Agricultural Project expand its attention to livestock. The disregard for animal husbandry contradicted the fact that Colombia contained more cattle than people and ignored the Colombian “dream about owning a piece of land and at least two head of cattle.” Expanding the RF’s focus on animals would bring the “support of a large proportion of the Colombian population,” including the influential Rancher’s Association.<sup>18</sup> By the early 1960s, RF collaborations in Colombia could be found in horticulture, soil science, dairy, poultry, and many other aspects of agricultural production, far exceeding the early impetus to work with maize, wheat, and beans.

As the program grew, the Cauca Valley maintained its position as a key agricultural center within the RF’s broader work in Colombia. The region had long impressed foreign travelers and RF personnel proved no exception. Norman Borlaug wrote in 1948 that the Palmira Agricultural Experiment Station was the best in Colombia.<sup>19</sup> Upon arrival, Jerry Grant gushed, “the Cauca Valley is the most beautiful land I’ve ever laid eyes on. It is the richest land I ever saw - and



I've seen some rich land. It's as rich as the Mississippi delta land, and in fact is better, because crops will grow there the year round. We can grow two crops of corn, and with a little irrigation it wouldn't be any trouble at all to grow three crops of beans."<sup>20</sup> Yet, despite such potential, observers also described an underperforming agrarian landscape, one with vast tracts of rich soil wasted as fallow or for cattle grazing. Herrell F. DeGraff, an agricultural economist from Cornell granted a RF fellowship in 1953, joined the chorus of the Cauca Valley's unrealized potential.

Although the region was "outstanding" among Colombia's "truly superb garden spots," only one quarter of the land was in crop production with the remaining three quarters given to pasture. "I doubt that the Cauca Valley is now producing a quarter of the food it might easily produce under a more balanced system of well-managed crop and livestock agriculture," he wrote.<sup>21</sup> This notion of wasted opportunity motivated RF staff in the Cauca Valley in their broader campaign to increase the global food supply. Under the leadership of RF officers such as Jerry Grant, Lewis Roberts, and J. George Harrar, the Colombian Agricultural Program focused intensely on staple crops at its field sites in Bogotá, Medellín, and Cali/Palmira. Corn research for tropical lowland crosses became a cornerstone of the RF project in the Cauca Valley. Despite the presence of a corn germ plasm bank in Medellín, RF-sponsored corn research gradually shifted south toward the Cauca Valley site, owing to the need for further research on maize production in the global tropics.<sup>22</sup> RF personnel saw potential for more than corn in the Cauca Valley too. In 1964, John W. Gibler and Charles F. Krull described the region as key to the expansion of wheat into the "hot tropics." The breeding program in Palmira, they reported, already had two new wheat varieties available for release with "tremendous potential impact" around the world.<sup>23</sup>

These genetic achievements fit the RF's Malthusian-inspired agenda of increasing the food supply in a world with an exponentially rising population. Many observers noticed Colombia's expanding cities and high prices of food and

worried about the repercussions. Herrell F. DeGraff wondered in 1953 “how long a situation could continue in which a half-kilo loaf of bread cost a quarter of a day’s wages for an industrial worker before a revolution might grow out of popular disgust and despair.” Much of Colombian agriculture, he decried, was stuck in a “sixteenth or seventeenth century type of farming...and even where change and advance are coming rapidly, as in the Cauca Valley, much lack of information and a good deal of downright ignorance is impeding full realization of the production possibilities from the changes that have been made.”<sup>24</sup>

Population growth, hunger, and poverty harbored the embrace of ideologies considered hostile to the Rockefeller Foundation and capitalist societies, according to RF personnel. In this way, agronomy emerged as an important ideological arena in the Cold War. The RF Advisory Committee for Agricultural Activities laid this out succinctly in 1951. Hunger, they said, had replaced disease as the great problem of the day. “Hunger, the incapacity of the hungry, the resulting general want, the pressures of expanding and demanding population, and the reckless instability of people who have nothing to lose and perhaps something to gain by embracing new political ideologies designed not to create individual freedom but to destroy it - these seem to be basic dangers of our present world.”<sup>25</sup> Identifying the enemy and the solution directly, they continued, “Communism makes attractive promises to underfed peoples; democracy must not only promise as much, but must deliver more.”<sup>26</sup> Especially after the Cuban Revolution of 1959, the US State Department and philanthropic organizations such as the Rockefeller Foundation used more explicit language in describing agronomy as an ideological struggle in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

With the growth of the Colombian Agricultural Program, the Rockefeller Foundation helped sponsor institutional changes during the 1960s. In 1962, the Colombian national government under President Alberto Lleras Camargo passed Decree 1562, creating the Colombian Agricultural and Livestock Institute (ICA). ICA would integrate research with education and extension. A Colombian

commission visited the United States in 1959 and wrote a report highlighting the necessity of such an integrated approach. Then, a 1962 meeting in New York between representatives of the Colombian government and the Rockefeller, Kellogg, and Ford Foundations led to the drafting of what such a Colombian institution might look like.<sup>27</sup> ICA forecast the gradual phasing out of the RF Colombian Agricultural Program.

Like ICA, the Rockefeller Foundation stepped back from the Colombian Agricultural Program by helping to launch the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) in Palmira. CIAT effectively replaced the RF's field site in Palmira, itself an extension of Cauca Valley agricultural development efforts dating to the 1920s. The Colombian government contributed the land for the CIAT site, near a new international airport between the cities of Cali and Palmira. The Rockefeller Foundation, with the Ford and Kellogg Foundations, in turn contributed initial financing.<sup>28</sup> Plans for the site were agreed to in 1967 with funds allocated the following year.<sup>29</sup> A dedication ceremony officially launched CIAT's operations on October 12, 1973, with John H. Knowles, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, in attendance along with Jerry Grant, assigned to be the first Director General of the new institution.<sup>30</sup> This new international center would research and experiment with tropical crops such as yucca, rice, and maize, along with livestock, in an effort to enhance tropical food production around the world.

The emergence of ICA and the establishment of CIAT in the Cauca Valley reflect the RF's gradual shift in the 1960s from national projects to coordinated international research sites and agendas. The RF began to invest less specifically in Mexico or Colombia or Chile or India, and more in international research stations such as CIAT for tropical lowland crops or CIMMYT in Mexico for wheat or the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines. Significantly, the RF annual reports from this era reflect these changes. In 1965-66, the Program in Agricultural Sciences Annual Report switched from its previous *organization by*

*country* program field office (Mexico always first, followed by Colombia, Chile, India, etc) with subsections within each on crops and research pursuits to an *organization by crop* with specific country experiences embedded within the text.<sup>31</sup> This suggests the changing focus from earlier national development programs to a more ambitious global project to combat hunger in the context of Cold War ideological battles for hearts and minds.

The Rockefeller Foundation's work in Colombia, and more specifically in the Cauca Valley, comprises an important element in my broader dissertation outline. Starting in the 1920s, I trace the local roots of agricultural development projects in the Cauca Valley. The entrance of the Rockefeller Foundation in the postwar period signals a shift toward a more internationalist development approach, led by the United States but with a strong remaining element of collaboration. As the Rockefeller Foundation phased out its national programs and helped launch international science research sites, the so-called Green Revolution in agricultural genetics, mechanization, and chemical inputs had spread around the world with varying degrees of success, failure, and acceptance. In the Cauca Valley, the international CIAT site, with its emphasis on increasing staple food production, stood in growing contrast to the regional reality of expanding sugar agribusiness. The chapters of my dissertation that follow my focus on the Rockefeller Foundation will examine the rise of sugar as a monocrop in the Cauca Valley and consider the disconnect between Cold War rhetoric about expanding food production and local realities of land tenure and corporate consolidation.

<sup>1</sup> Making fifteen commutes to the Rockefeller Archive Center from New Haven, CT during the summer and fall of 2014, I first examined the RF Project Files for Latin America (R.G. 1.1, project 300; R.G. 1.2, project 100; R.G. 1.2, project 300) and Colombia (R.G. 1.1, project 311; 1.2, project 311). I looked at specific documents in other Record Groups, gleaned from the finding aids, including reports outlining the RF's position on the world food situation (R.G. 3.1, Series 915, Box 3, Folder 23), RF consultants and temporary aides in agriculture (R.G. 3.2, Series 923, Boxes 1-10), etc. The Record Group collections

for other agriculture sites proved useful, with relevant material and correspondence related to Colombia (R.G. 6.7 New Delhi Field Office Records; R.G. 6.13 Mexico Field Office Records). Record Group 6.9, Cali, Colombia Field Office Records included substantial information. The Agricultural Journal Series Papers, 1-136 compiled in a bound volume, contained interesting material. I spent more than one day collecting from the bound annual reports of the RF Agricultural Operating Programs/ Program in Agricultural Sciences. During my last few visits, I found significant material in the R.G. 12 Officer Diaries and R.G. 13 Oral Histories from individuals involved in Colombia, including J.G. Harrar, H.M. Miller, Lewis M. Roberts, Ulysses Jerry Grant, and others. Likewise, the personal paper collection on file for H.M. Miller proved useful. I briefly scanned through the R.G. 2 General Correspondence, searching for key names and sites in the indices. Finally, multimedia, including the RF Photograph Collection, the Ford Foundation Photograph Collection, and the 1960 documentary “Harvest” (DVD AV861, Box 1) offered great variety and imagery, which, although mostly left out of this report, will lend perspective to the finished dissertation.

<sup>2</sup> “Subject Guide,” Series 311, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation records, Rockefeller Archive Center.

<sup>3</sup> “Colombian Agricultural Program,” 12/1/1953, pg. 1, Folder 1, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>4</sup> Harry M. Miller, Jr., interviewed by William C. Cobb, February 14, 1967, pg. 25, Box 19, Oral Histories, RG 13, RF records, RAC.

<sup>5</sup> “Trustees’ Confidential Monthly Report, December 1952,” pg 22, Folder 1, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>6</sup> H.M. Miller to Gonzalo Restrepo Jaramillo (Colombian Ambassador to the United States), 4/30/1948, Folder 7, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>7</sup> Richard Bradfield and Paul C. Mangelsdorf, “Report on a Trip to Colombia and Other South and Central American Countries, June 10-July 8, 1948,” pg. 2, Folder 7, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pg 12.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., pg. 16-17.

<sup>10</sup> For more on the early history of the Palmira Agricultural Experiment Station, see Timothy W. Lorek, “Imagining the Midwest in Latin America: US Advisors and the Envisioning of an Agricultural Middle Class in Colombia’s Cauca Valley, 1943-1946,” *The Historian* 75:2 (Summer 2013), Pp. 283-305, as well as my forthcoming dissertation from Yale University.

<sup>11</sup> Richard Bradfield and Paul C. Mangelsdorf, “Report on a Trip to Colombia and Other South and Central American Countries, June 10-July 8, 1948,” pg. 17, Folder 7, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>12</sup> “Grant in Aid for the Faculty of Agronomy, National University of Colombia, Cali, Colombia,” April 18, 1947, Folder 43, Box 5, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>13</sup> RF Appropriations: Operating Program in Agriculture, December 6-7, 1955, Folder 9, Box 2, Series 300D, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>14</sup> Operating Program in Agricultural Sciences, December 5-6, 1961, Folder 9, Box 2, Series 300D, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>15</sup> D.D. Harpstead, “Corn Program,” in “Summary of Activities of the Colombian Agricultural Program of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1950 to 1964 and Recommendations by the staff for Cooperation with ICA,” October 1964, pg. 2, Folder

815, Box 86, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>16</sup> “Colombian Agricultural Program,” 12/1/1953, pg. 2, Folder 1, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>17</sup> Norman E. Borlaug, “Research on Wheat and Other Small Grains in South America,” Report from South America Trip, November-December 1952, pg. 21, Folder 33A, Box 5, Series 300, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>18</sup> Warren Weaver memorandum to Dr. Bradfield, Dr. Harrar, Dr. Manglesdorf, and Dr. Stakman, quoting H.M. Miller, 1/2/1951, pg. 2, Folder 5, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.1, RF records, RAC.

<sup>19</sup> Norman E. Borlaug, “General Notes and Impressions Concerning Agricultural Problems and Agricultural Investigation and Instruction in Central America, Colombia and Venezuela,” February 8-March 7, 1948, pg. 1, Folder 3, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>20</sup> “Trustees’ Confidential Monthly Report, December 1952,” pg 22, Folder 1, Box 1, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>21</sup> Herrell F. DeGraff, “Report on Colombia,” October 15, 1953, pg 7, Folder 819, Box 86, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>22</sup> J. George Harrar, Transcript of Taped Interviews (1978-1979), pg. 130, RF records, RAC.

<sup>23</sup> John W. Gibler and Charles F. Krull, “Small Grains,” in “Summary of Activities of the Colombian Agricultural Program of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1950 to 1964 and Recommendations by the staff for Cooperation with ICA,” October 1964, pg. 6, Folder 815, Box 86, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>24</sup> Herrell F. DeGraff, “Report on Colombia,” October 15, 1953, pg. 2, Folder 819, Box 86, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>25</sup> RF Advisory Committee for Agricultural Activities, “The World Food Problem, Agriculture, and the Rockefeller Foundation,” June 21, 1951, pg. 1, Folder 23, Box 3, Series 915, RG 3, RAC.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pg 4.

<sup>27</sup> “Historia del Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario,” *Republica*, June 2, 1968, Folder 76, Box 12, Series 311, RG 1.2, RF records, RAC.

<sup>28</sup> “Tropical Crops Studied,” *New York Times*, November 18, 1968, Folder 698, Box 27, Subseries A: International Agricultural Center Files, 1966-1980, Office Files of David Bell, Office of the Vice President, Ford Foundation, RAC.

<sup>29</sup> Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical: Proposed Program, Staff, Budget, May, 1968, Folder 2: Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical, 1968-69, Box 1, Series 3, W.M Myers Papers, RF records, RAC.

<sup>30</sup> Photograph, “Dedication of CIAT, October 12, 1973,” Folder 370, Box 36, Series 1049: John H. Knowles, Special Collections Photographs, RAC.

<sup>31</sup> RF Program in Agricultural Sciences, Annual Report, 1965-66, RF records, RAC.