

I

Sometimes the period of change is an age of hope, sometimes it is an age of despair. When mankind has slipped its cables, sometimes it is bent on the discovery of a New World; sometimes it is haunted by the dim sound of the breakers dashing on the rocks ahead

Alfred North Whitehead

By the mid-seventies, with a membership of just over three quarters of a million Rotarians and support for The Rotary Foundation running at the rate of \$7 million per year, there were many who were content and felt comfortable with what we had. Board policy stressed the autonomy of the individual club, discouraging any venture into what was termed "corporate activity". The official policy seemed to be that there was ample opportunity for each Rotary club, as a separate entity, to direct its energies in service to its own local community, and also to engage in any one of the diverse international programs available, but to do so in isolation, within the limits of its own resources. And so we hacked at the branches of ill health, malnutrition, hunger, poverty, illiteracy, — in a multitude of relatively small and unrelated projects, at home and abroad, when all the while we might have been attacking the roots.

As I moved toward the presidency of R.I. in 1978, seeking to give practical expression to a theme which was already in my mind ("Reach Out"), and as I listened to what people were saying, it became apparent that somehow we had to develop a plan which would enable Rotarians to give practical expression to their compassion and their concern for world-wide problems — problems we had no hope of tackling while we remained shackled by the constraints of our policy against "corporate action".

I had seen what was possible through FAIM (Fourth Avenue in

Motion) and IPAC (International Projects Advisory Committee) when clubs, working together, were able to achieve infinitely more than in isolation; and it wasn't very hard to sell that idea. But to break the mould: to change the practices and traditions of the past under long-established board policy which actively discouraged clubs working together on large projects – that was another thing. And yet it was simply done.

Our board, at its first meeting, amended existing board policy, recognising the autonomy of individual clubs, but encouraging them to engage in world-wide Rotary programs, so that their involvement was voluntary – not mandatory.

To all but the dyed-in-the-wool traditionalists this was not only acceptable, but welcome. But there was strong opposition from some of Rotary's most senior people – past R.I. presidents, past directors, a past general secretary – people who commanded respect, and whose opinions were valued. However, it seemed to me that in their concern for the preservation of past practices and policies they failed to appreciate the opportunity to extend our reach in a way and to a degree not then possible.

The challenge to the 3H program was broadly pursued before the program took hold, as we shall see later. And yet despite the opposition (perhaps even because of it) Rotarians around the world cared enough to support it financially, and to defend an idea whose time had come.

Those early days in the life of the program were exciting for all of us – for those on the board and on the 3H committee and for the thousands of Rotarians around the world who had a vision of what could be accomplished working together. But I doubt that any of us then anticipated the pace of change, not just in the program, but perhaps more significantly in the personality (as it were) of Rotary.

For in the development of the 3H program, from the initial project to immunise 6.3 million children in the Philippines against polio, to the much more ambitious target to rid the world of polio by the turn of the century, we see the emergence of a growing confidence in our ability as an organisation to accomplish great things. We know, and the world knows, that Rotary is much more than a group of local men and women

meeting weekly to undertake local community projects (however worthy) and to talk about goodwill and peace and a better world. Together, pooling our resources, we are building the better world we used to talk about. For instance :-

In Bangladesh a man, one of a number trained in the techniques of inland fish farming under a 3H grant, is now a successful small business man, with fourteen fish ponds, providing employment and supplying a much needed high protein supplement to the diet of his local people. Multiply that a hundred fold and imagine the impact that project is making in the lives of villagers in Bangladesh.

Just a few miles down the road is a current 3H project, an integrated agricultural and community development project. The faces of the members of the Rotary Club of Mymensingh glow with pride, as they introduce a group of women, each with a goat provided by the club – two of the offspring to be given back to the club to be passed on in turn to other women whose only qualification for assistance is that they are absolutely destitute. Now they have milk, and the nucleus of a small herd. Now they have just a small ray of hope in an otherwise bleak existence.

As part of the same project, a poultry farmer who has built his initial 20 birds to a flock of 500 says with great enthusiasm that he will have 1000 by the end of the year. Dairy farmers have a brighter future because their animals are now much more productive under of the cross-breeding program initiated under the club's project. Young people, each with a donated calf, are suddenly comparatively rich.

In an isolated village in the north of Thailand Past District Governor Dr. Dick Walker introduced a revolutionary method of teaching reading and writing, which has developed to the point that it is now the universally adopted method of teaching literacy in that country, recognised and supported by the Thai Government. Dick refers to it as a "lighthouse project" because it demonstrates to other developing countries a literacy program which has changed the lives of millions.

Wilborn Chavula, a youth in Malawi, crippled by polio, no longer grovels in the dust, his hand held out begging for charity, because Dr. Joe Serra, a volunteer orthopaedic surgeon from Stockton (California) performed a simple

operation enabling him to walk, and a Rotary-sponsored vocational training school has taught him new skills. No longer condemned to living the life of a beggar, he is now a school teacher.

Mothers in Guatemala City, taught under a Rotary nutrition program how to prepare nutritious meals from readily available ingredients, are spared the anguish of sending their children to bed hungry.

And around the world the mothers of more than a billion children who no longer live in the shadow of the menace of polio rejoice as we work toward a polio-free world, in partnership with WHO, UNICEF, the US Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, and national governments and their health ministries.

For to-day we are recognised world-wide, by governments, by agencies of the United Nations and other national and international welfare agencies, by world leaders, and by millions in the crowded slums of big cities and primitive villages, as that organisation of caring people which has marshalled its scattered resources and committed them to major projects making a difference in the lives of people.

For, as R.I. Past General Secretary Herb Pigman said: "There can be no doubt that the 3H and polioplus programs have contributed greatly to an understanding and appreciation of Rotary in every country. I believe this particularly to be true in the newly independent nations of Africa, where Rotary's image changed in the eyes of government from that of a vestige of colonialism to that of an indigenous force for social good."

Over the years, since taking to the February 1978 meeting of the Board of Directors of R.I. the idea which we know to-day as 3H, I have been asked by many people when, and why, and how the idea was born. There is no simple answer - no single event - no moment in time - to mark its birth. It evolved. To some I suggested it was in an aeroplane high above the deserts between Las Vegas and Tulsa, Oklahoma. And in a sense it was. To others I have replied that it was merely an extension of an idea, which had been propounded for several years by Dr. Ben Saltzman of Little Rock, Arkansas, to involve Rotarian doctors in humanitarian work. And certainly that idea was a factor.

More recently, with the benefit of hindsight and perhaps the

wisdom of the years, I have come to realise that the seed which germinated at the board meeting in February, 1978, was planted forty years earlier in the impressionable mind of a teenager growing up during the 1930s depression, acutely aware of the plight of the disadvantaged. That sense of obligation to alleviate the suffering of those with less was strengthened during my visit to India in 1965 as incoming district governor, and, in the resultant development of a district project (which harnessed the resources of all the clubs in the district in a major project to meet some of those needs), there was born a realisation of how much more could be achieved with the combined resources of larger numbers.

For, just as the birth of the idea cannot be attributed entirely to any one event or person, so too its development into a program destined to make an impact upon the lives of millions is a product of the skill and thought and commitment of many people, whose contribution will become apparent as this history unfolds.

The catalyst for the introduction to the board of R.I. in February, 1978, was undoubtedly that aeroplane flight to Tulsa, in the company of R.I. Past Director Mike Pedrick, who had asked me what plans I had for my year as president. I told him I'd like to be able to give practical expression to the theme for the year (Reach Out), in some program which would involve large numbers of Rotary volunteers working in developing countries on projects to improve the lot of the disadvantaged, and cited Ben Saltzman's idea of organising Rotarian doctors to do this, not just in an informal way, but in a structured program.

Then Mike told me the story of a Rotarian doctor who had been asked, by the minister of his church, to serve as a volunteer in a mission hospital in South America for a period of six weeks. He was a busy man, with commitments which made it impossible to give that amount of time in one stretch; but he decided he could give two weeks, and perhaps there would be two others who would make a similar commitment. So he put up a notice at the hospital at which he worked, briefly outlining the proposal, advising a time and place at which he would like to meet any volunteer. To his amazement, he had offers from more than 100 people (doctors, nurses, tradesmen) all willing to

serve.

"Clem," said Mike, "there are thousands of Rotarians out there willing to serve, if they can be given the opportunity."

So a few days later I went to the board meeting, under the chairmanship of President Jack Davis, with this idea churning over in my mind, but with no intention of raising it there. I would introduce it to the first meeting of the 1978-79 board, immediately prior to the start of my year in office, which was the customary procedure. But two things happened at that meeting in February, 1978, to change my mind – not so much on the idea itself (although child immunisation became the immediate focus), but also on the timing of its introduction.

President Jack Davis had developed an interest in the possibility of having Rotary involved worldwide as advocates for mass immunisation against the six communicable diseases taking such a devastating toll on the children of the world. He had invited to a meeting of the executive committee of the board Dr. Robert Hingson and Gene Heck (of Brother's Brother Foundation) to tell of their work in that field. Over a period of a couple of hours Dr. Hingson spoke persuasively of the work of his organisation, and of the desirability of Rotary involvement. Jack subsequently reported to the board with a memorandum (pages F 185-F 188 of the transcript), in these words:-

I would like to thank the board of directors for taking time on Wednesday to hear directly from Rotarians Dr. Robert Hingson and Gene Heck about a great world health need and opportunity for service, in which he has been directly involved.

In describing the need for worldwide immunisation efforts, he cited the benefits that would accrue. Of all the service clubs, he said, Rotarians are better equipped than any other to marshal the resources of their communities and their nations in an effort that could, literally, wipe out childhood diseases such as diphtheria, whooping cough, infantile paralysis, measles and smallpox.

The purpose in inviting Dr. Hingson to tell you about his work was not to suggest that Rotary International link arms corporately with the Brother's Brother Foundation or any other agency – of which there are many engaged in such work.

The purpose was to stimulate our thinking on how Rotary clubs and Rotarians might lend their collective strength to meet a major world need, and what role Rotary International might play in such a humanitarian cause.

1979 is "The Year of the Child". The 1980's will be designated by the United Nations as the "Decade of the Child". These will represent a unique opportunity for Rotarians to help solve a problem that is shared by all nations. Its solution or amelioration would be of immense benefit to people, and Rotary's identification with helping to meet that need can be of significant benefit to the vitality of Rotary.

An effort such as this could become a program emphasis for a year or more without in any way diminishing the variety of other Rotary forms of service, or trespassing on the autonomy of the club. How could Rotary International provide leadership?

A few suggestions which occur to me are:

1) bring to the attention of the Rotary clubs of the world the need for immunisation of children. Inform them of opportunities that exist in co-operation with agencies of their choice, including national health ministries.

2) appropriate a substantial sum in the budget of Rotary International – perhaps \$30,000 or more for each of two or more years – to communicate the need by means of publications tailored to the needs and languages of Rotarians in various areas.

3) inform the World Health Organisation, headquartered in Geneva, that Rotary supports its 'Expanded Program on Immunisation' and solicit its help and expertise in developing suggestions on how Rotary can help on the local level. It is expected, for example, that Rotary clubs can play a useful role in areas such as community education on the need, organising immunisation campaigns, providing funds and equipment, and offering volunteer help.

Thus at modest cost, Rotary International could stimulate Rotary clubs to take part in a worldwide health improvement effort which holds so many humanitarian and economic benefits for mankind. It would be a program in which the collective strength of Rotary could have significant impact. It deals with a

need in which many clubs already are involved. It would serve to demonstrate how our worldwide manpower might be brought to bear on other world needs, too.

Might we launch such a program emphasis at the 1978 convention of Rotary International? On Wednesday of that meeting, the entire day is devoted to world community service – with the opportunity for a major speaker on a theme related to this program. It is my thought that Dr. Hingson himself, as a fellow Rotarian deeply and personally involved, might begin the task of motivation by addressing that convention on a theme related to world community service, and the worldwide need for immunisation of children.

Burton Grossman's immediate endorsement reflected the enthusiasm of the board: "Mr. President, your idea seems to fit hand in glove with the project that President-elect Clem has and he's concentrating on his 3H program. I can't think of anything more forceful and more productive and inspiring for the beginning of his Rotary year than to have somebody like this doctor to make this kind of presentation."

The part Jack Davis played in our involvement in worldwide immunisation has been insufficiently recognised. It was he who first brought it to Rotary's agenda, and actively promoted it. Against the magnitude of our subsequent achievements, his relatively modest proposal to spend up to \$30,000 per year for two or more years in an educational (rather than operational) program must be measured against the attitudes and circumstances then prevailing. We were primarily a local community service organisation, operating still within the constraints of a decision made more than 50 years earlier, which frowned upon so-called 'corporate action', discouraging clubs from combining their resources for major projects, hence his suggestion that Rotary help on the local level. President Jack's vision of Rotary's capacity to make a difference in the lives of people extended to the possibility of our using our organisational strength and structure to influence governments to give greater priority to the health needs of the people. But he had not yet discovered the key to broaden our

tradition of purely local activity to explore new possibilities 'beyond the local horizon'.

We were still operating in the shadow of Resolution 23-24 – a resolution of the Convention which, in 1923, was still the legislative body of R.I. Rotary then was virtually a U.S. institution with nearly 90% of the clubs in that one country. 95% of the 1923 convention attendees were from the U.S. All members of the Resolution Committee were Americans. As one of my Rotary friends once said: "It was a statement of extreme conservatism. It was to hamstring Rotary for the next 50 + years. It was to become a beloved document of Rotary leaders and somehow became enshrined in glory. It was to be a perfect excuse for not doing anything too important." If that judgment sounds too harsh, consider what has been achieved since we broke the shackles of Resolution 23-24.

I mentioned earlier that there were two things which happened at that meeting which caused me to change my mind about deferring the whole proposal to the start of my year in office. Dr. Hingson's dramatic presentation and the plans to use him at the Tokyo convention was one. The other was the urgency to plan for the approaching 75th Anniversary of Rotary, now just two years away. Preparations for that event needed to be planned immediately. We had spent quite a deal of time early in the meeting trying to identify some activity which would be worthy of this milestone in our history, but without success.

That evening I went to the small room which had been made available to me as president-elect, and typed up a memorandum (in effect, the first draft of the 3H proposal). Shortly after midnight I deposited it on the desk of President Jack Davis, with a note suggesting that, if he thought it appropriate, it might be considered for discussion by the board as a focal point of the 75th year celebrations. Although different in many respects from the program finally adopted, the essential thrust of the proposal (and the one which attracted so much opposition later) was to harness the resources of Rotary clubs worldwide working together to meet humanitarian needs in third world countries. Here is the text of that proposal, as recorded in the transcript of board discussion (pages F 203-F206). The first two paragraphs focus on the essential elements of the proposal – the raising of the money and the use

to which it would be put (the 3 Hs.) although the program was not then known by that name.

PRESIDENT DAVIS: May I now turn to the Paul Harris Merit Award. May I ask you, Clem, to present this item now.

PRESIDENT-ELECT RENOUF: I appreciate the opportunity. May I read this because I realize that you may not all have had an opportunity to do so.

Paul Harris Merit Award

1. PURPOSE - To provide to Rotary clubs an opportunity to recognize the outstanding service by an individual (not necessarily a Rotarian), by an award of a 'Paul Harris Merit Award', which would not be in the form of a medallion or other item to be worn, but in the form for framing or mounting on a desk.

2. FUNDING - Each award to cost U.S. \$2,000 the proceeds to establish a fund (perhaps 'The Rotary World Community Fund') to be invested in perpetuity, the net income to be applied annually in or toward some field of world community service - e.g. immunization of children, relief of hunger, research into improved bacteriological processes for production and preservation of food, illiteracy, village level farming.

3. ONE TIME ONLY AWARD - This would not be a continuing program. It could be launched at the Tokyo Convention, and closed on 30 June 1980. This would give clubs two years in which to raise the funds for one award. Thus, it would not be a continuing competitor to The Rotary Foundation.

4. THE POTENTIAL - If every Rotary Club subscribed for one award, the capital fund would exceed \$35 million. Some will subscribe for more than one. Many will not have the capacity to raise that sum of money. However, if \$20 million were raised over the two-year period (and I believe this to be a realistic and attainable target), invested at 7 per cent per annum, the net annual income would be \$1.4 million.

With that level of income available to fund a major emphasis or thrust in World Community Service each year, the world would know about Rotary - and since (hopefully) the money would be spent in such a way that people were involved, we could make a very real contribution to world understanding, multiplied many times over by the voluntary effort associated

with each project. For instance, volunteers travelling abroad could probably be encouraged for an average of \$1,000 per person for fares. Thus, 1,400 volunteers per year could be organized, giving of their time and skills. This is about the present level of involvement of people in The Rotary Foundation.

5. ADMINISTRATION OF THE FUND - This would not (and should not) be a fund within The Rotary Foundation. It should be a separate fund, but administered, so far as fiscal responsibility is concerned, by the same people administering the funds of The Foundation. They would be trustees of both funds.

6. DISPOSITION OF ANNUAL INCOME - This would be within the control of the Board of Directors of Rotary International. It would be their fund, to control and direct. The trustees would be trustees on behalf of the board.

7. HOW SOON COULD IT BE LAUNCHED? - An announcement at the Tokyo Convention would be the ideal launching pad. It could be in full operation by 1 July, 1978. The board in 1979-80 could have the privilege of nominating the first program on 23 February 1980".

PRESIDENT DAVIS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT-ELECT RENOUF: President Jack, that's an outline of what I see could be a possibility for the opportunity of appointing a small committee, but in general terms and in general principle, I think there is something here which could have a great effect upon the 1978 convention at Tokyo and a great effect upon Rotary in years ahead.

It is inevitable that a proposal such as this, breaking new ground, should be modified at the hands of a group of men such as those on the Board of R.I. I must confess I was disappointed that the idea of a permanent fund was abandoned in favour of spending the entire fund over a period of five years. This was contrary to my own personal approach to financial management. I preferred a longer term and more permanent perspective than the board wished to embrace. As subsequent events proved, they were right - but not for reasons any of us anticipated at the time.

Of course we changed the name (more of that later) and the way we recognised contributions to the fund, awarding

banners and plaques to Rotary clubs instead of certificates or plaques to people who had given significant community service. I think we missed a golden opportunity in local community awareness and national and international public relations by forfeiting the chance to recognise outstanding people in thousands of communities around the world on the same day – Rotary's 75th anniversary.

The relationship between the board and the trustees was not then as close or as co-operative as it is to-day, which explains my original proposal to have this new program operated by the board, which would hold the funds subscribed, but administered, so far as fiscal responsibility was concerned, by the same people administering the funds of The Foundation. It was only after we had collected about \$1 million that it was discovered that under the terms of our Constitution the board had no authority to hold and administer those funds; that they should come under the control of the trustees. By this time there were several of the trustees, alarmed at the new direction in which we were heading under the 3H program, who were reluctant to accept them. One of them even went so far as to ask: "Why should we have to launder their money?" I wonder whether there will ever be another instance when the trustees will be reluctant to accept \$1 million, contributed by Rotarians and Rotary clubs. I think not. They were interesting (and sometimes frustrating) times.

In fact, early in my term as president two of the past presidents met me by appointment in my office at Evanston and pleaded with me not to proceed with the program. Their concern was that it would adversely affect annual contributions to The Rotary Foundation which then stood at \$12 million – that it would, in their words 'prick the bubble'. Seven years later, as Chairman of The Trustees, I was delighted to be able to report that contributions were then running at twice that rate – \$25 million; and that in that seven year period we had received more than twice as much as the total for the previous 61 years, and that our corpus had doubled from \$40 million to \$80 million.

There's a lesson in that which we should never forget (and the PolioPlus campaign later confirmed it) – when challenging goals are set, whether at club, district or international level,

Rotarians generally will respond generously.

Although "The Paul Harris Merit Award" was the name I had originally suggested for the fund raising activity, I had not suggested a name for the program those funds would make possible. That happened after President Jack Davis shared with me details of his program for the Wednesday morning of his convention in Tokyo. Dr. Hingston (demonstrating the use of his 'peace gun') would be a persuasive advocate for large scale immunisation (Health) and Dr. James Hester (Rector of the United Nations University in Tokyo) would be focusing on world hunger and human and social development. Here were the three elements of the program I had earlier suggested in my memorandum to the board – Health, Hunger and Humanity. Here the name was born.

Following the February, 1978, meeting of the board, President Jack asked Herb Pigman (then his executive assistant) to visit the World Health Organisation in Geneva when he was in Europe on other Rotary business. Herb subsequently reported on that meeting to the board on the morning of 26 April, 1978, in a memorandum dated 18 April, 1978. After showing examples of simple pictorial guides to the diagnosis of smallpox which led to the tracking down of smallpox cases worldwide by WHO, and to its virtual eradication, and detailing the basic program objectives of WHO in their expanded program on immunisation, he suggested that Rotary's strategy to assist WHO in its goal to immunise every child in the world by 1990 could be:-

1. Recognising that the needs and priorities differ in each country, the role of Rotary International might best be to inform Rotary clubs about the need, to motivate them to do something about it, and to produce and distribute an illustrated pamphlet informing clubs and individuals of ways they can assist this special international community service program on local, national and regional levels.

2. To request the trustees of The Rotary Foundation, as a commitment from Rotarians worldwide, to fund the production, in co-operation with the World Health Organisation, of an animated, non-verbal film on the concept of immunisation, and the benefits of immunisation – a tool vitally needed to convince people on all levels, including the village mothers, to whom

modern medical science is a mystery.

The cost of producing such a film was estimated to be \$50,000, and of the pamphlet about \$1 a copy.

Royce Abbey (second vice president) seized enthusiastically on the prospect of support from The Rotary Foundation:-

Mr. President, what appeals to me is the opportunity of having The Rotary Foundation involved. There appears to be a great need under the banner of The Foundation for a new look, a new approach or a new direction that may in turn get even greater support from around the Rotary world.

Sadly, this same enthusiasm was not mirrored in the attitude of a majority of the Trustees, who were in fact fearful that any such new initiative would undermine support for The Foundation. I have no official confirmation of their alleged rejection of an approach by President Jack for funding of the proposal suggested by Herb Pigman; but certainly there is no record of any Foundation money having been used for that purpose.

Despite the lack of evidence of support from the Trustees of The Rotary Foundation, there were those on the board who realised the potential for development of a significant program, particularly in partnership with the World Health Organisation. Director Ed Detering sought to express this vision:

Education is all to the good, but to me the key is implementation. We need to start with education, but we need a total program of implementation plus education.

But there were doubts expressed regarding Rotary's capacity to do the job. Drawing upon his experience with another organisation supported by Rotary, engaged in a major humanitarian project, one of the directors cautioned:-

I think the whole crux of this matter will be that whatever we decide to do has got to be channeled into an organisation headed by someone with terrific enthusiasm, and with an organisation doing that one job. I doubt, frankly, whether our

3H committees would have the personnel of the type to handle this type of tremendous program. It needs a separate organisation doing this one thing, and probably outside Rotarians as such.

Fortunately, not everyone agreed. But everyone had an opinion. One member suggested that if R.I. went through the World Health Organisation, we would have a well-designed, well-organised effort, and our dollars and efforts would be more effective. Another cautioned that WHO, as a specialised agency of United Nations, might be regarded as a political organisation, and that Rotary International might therefore be exposing itself by association to certain aspects that would not be in keeping with our beliefs.

Another suggested that our primary purpose was not to provide a sum of money or to alleviate a physical need, but to use these as a vehicle to get to know people, to understand them, and to be understood.

And of course the concern was raised that under the existing board policy "it is not within the scope of the purpose of Rotary International for R.I. to corporately sponsor a particular project or program".

Finally, out of a long and wide-ranging discussion, there emerged a board decision (No. 361 of 1977-78) which read:-

The board agrees that a program be undertaken which will enable and encourage Rotary clubs and Rotarians to become involved in a worldwide effort for the immunization of children and adults, and refers this subject to the president and members of the board in 1978-79 for implementation in accordance with the discussion at this meeting.

Further, the board requests the Trustees of The Rotary Foundation to give consideration to developing an award program related to immunization efforts, with a view to providing training for individuals involved in the direction or supervision of immunization programs.

Again, the request to the Trustees fell upon deaf ears.

But I don't think this deterred any of us. Certainly, it didn't deter me, because the whole concept of the 3H program was that

it would be launched, funded and administered by the board – and there was no doubting their enthusiasm and support.

So I looked forward with keen anticipation to the months ahead – the International Assembly at which I would be able to share the dream with the incoming team of governors, the International Convention in Tokyo (anticipated attendance 40,000) at which it would be launched, and a year in which to sell the idea. Because of President Jack Davis's characteristic co-operation, we were able to start the year running. Another, less generous, would have insisted that he be allowed to see his year out before I launched into mine.

What I didn't know was that a small but influential group (mostly past R.I. presidents and a past general secretary) would mount a strong effort to challenge the decision of the board (and later of the trustees).

But for the present I was confident – and it was in that confident frame of mind that I shared with the 375 incoming district governors at the International Assembly at Boca Raton the outline of the program. It was well received, because it represented not only a new program, but a new emphasis, a new direction. And these were a new generation of Rotary members, receptive to change.

I had asked Jack Davis to announce the new program at Tokyo, and at his request had supplied him with a wording to be incorporated into his principal address near the opening of the convention. For some reason he didn't ever explain, he omitted it, but suggested I do it. So at the appropriate time, in a scheduled speech, I included the official announcement of the launch of 3H, effective 1 July, 1978, in these words:-

Your board this past year, under the leadership of President Jack Davis, has devoted considerable time to a consideration of the means by which the vast reservoir of vocational skills and experience represented in our membership could be utilised.

As a direct result of that study and consideration, a new program will be launched during this coming year – a program which will bring a new dimension to our service activities. It will be known as 'The Health, Hunger and Humanity Program'.

After detailing the committee structure – a large 48-member committee, I went on:-

This will be a world-wide program. It will not conflict with any of our existing programs. World community service will still have its place, for those projects which involve club to club and district to district co-operation. The 3H program will go beyond this. It will reach out around the world, tackling tasks too big for any one club or any one district, but giving even to the smallest club and the individual Rotarian the opportunity but not the obligation to be part of it.

At the conclusion of that speech I handed to the General Secretary, on behalf of my own club (The Rotary Club of Nambour) a cheque for US\$1,000, so that it was the first club in the world to contribute to the program and to earn a recognition banner.

From that point on I was totally committed to promoting the program. My wife June sometimes wondered whether I was overdoing it, reminding me that there were other programs. But my reply was that this was big and new, and that when NASA launched a satellite into space most of the energy was expended getting it off the ground. Without it the satellite would never get into orbit. Also, of course, just as a rocket must overcome the powerful pull of gravity, so we had to overcome the dead weight of a determined opposition.

I am tempted to deal with this matter here, because that opposition became apparent early and continued for five years, but I think it better to deal with it separately. Although it was a persistent distraction (some would say 'irritant') for all that time, at no stage did it halt the ongoing momentum of the program. In fact it may well have advanced it, because it caused people to think more deeply about Rotary's purpose and potential, and to realise that there may be better ways to attain it.

Before we could proceed with the program, it was necessary to modify a policy established under Resolution 23-34 of the Convention in 1923 (which at that time was the legislative body of R.I.) and which had stood with only minor modifications for 55 years, amended by board decision in 1974-75 and again

by our board at its first meeting in 1978-79.

To demonstrate clearly the extent of our modification, quoted below is the policy as it stood before we amended it, with deletions shown in brackets and additions underlined:

The board agrees that it is not within the scope of the purpose of Rotary International for Rotary International as such corporately to sponsor a particular project or program (or to prescribe a uniform project or program for sponsorship by all Rotary clubs at the local club level) in which all Rotary clubs are required to participate. The purpose of Rotary is most effectively expressed through the activities of individual clubs and Rotarians covering the various avenues of Rotary service, determined by each club in consideration of its own abilities and resources and the interests of its members in particular needs and opportunities for service.

Almost a year later that decision was modified (May-June 1979, Item 345). President-elect Jim Bomar suggested this was a negatively expressed policy and that the board should consider a statement of policy that would be more positive, which it did in this decision:-

The board

a) agrees that the purpose of Rotary is most effectively expressed through the activities of individual clubs and Rotarians covering the various avenues of Rotary service, determined by each club in consideration of its own abilities and resources and the interests of its members and particular needs and opportunities for service, but recognizes that it is appropriate for Rotary International, as an association of clubs, to promulgate from time to time programs or projects which help to advance the object of Rotary and which would benefit from the collective effort of those clubs and individual Rotarians who wish to participate.

How appropriate it was that this more positive statement of

policy should have been fashioned and introduced by my successor in office, for there was no one more supportive than he in promoting the 3H program. In fact, had it not been for his enthusiasm, and his keen legal mind, the program may well have fallen victim to the forces opposed to it.

As Past President Bill Robbins once said to me, this was an unusual (if not exceptional) period in Rotary's history to that time - three presidents in a row, each committed to a new (and controversial) program. Fortunately, in recent years there is nothing exceptional in that. On major issues our presidents have learned and demonstrated the importance of continuity.

Although we were not aware of it at the time, an attempt had been made ten years earlier to have Rotary involved in a range of humanitarian projects, similar to those we were now proposing. On 28 January 1980 (19 months after the launch of the 3H program) Rolf Klarich received a letter from past director Dr. Michel Alexandre, which he passed on to me. It had attached to it a report of the annual district conference of district 167 (France) held on 20 April, 1968, containing a memorial to the board of R.I. which read:

Memorial presented by the Rotary Club of Bethune, district 167 of Rotary International, meeting at Valenciennes 20 April, 1968, on the occasion of its annual conference, deeply moved by the distress and misery of many countries, asks the Board of Directors to study the possibility of creating an International World Community Foundation, supported by all the clubs in the world (as the Rotary Foundation is), and designed to create or support all means of fighting illness, malnutrition and illiteracy.

There we see clearly identified the three elements of our new program - health, hunger and humanity. In a supporting statement, the memorial read: It seems that the creation of such a Foundation responds at once to the Rotarian ideal, to the wish of many R.I. officers for effectiveness, and above all, to the needs of a world which is too often divided by inequality of human conditions.

But the board rejected it, as it had to, because it called for the

support of all clubs, and would therefore have been mandatory and in consequence would have imposed a levy on every club, contrary to the fundamental right of each club to be autonomous.

In introducing a program with an identical purpose (although we were unaware of it at the time), we were providing the mechanism (particularly as to funding) to make it available to Rotary clubs on a voluntary basis, responding to a realisation by thousands of Rotary clubs such as Bethune, that we should be doing more to meet the needs of a needy world.

The 3H committee (48 men from 18 countries) was large and representative, but only the three co-chairmen met regularly - Dr. Ben Saltzman (Health), Webster Pendergrass (Hunger) and Cliff Dochterman (Humanity). Ben Saltzman was Chairman. They were a good team - Ben with his vision of what volunteers could accomplish, Webster with vast experience in humanitarian programs in third world countries, and Cliff, the ideas man with a great capacity to reduce complex ideas to simple statements. Vice-President Ed. Cadman (liaison director) and I (as President) were, of course, participants in these meetings.

I

We had our first meeting on 10 July, 1978. I had never served on a committee, charged with the responsibility of launching a new program, where there was absolutely no precedent (and it may well be the only one). There was no other program like it in Rotary. There was no established organisational structure. We had no staff specifically assigned, simply because we didn't know what staff (if any) would be needed, and there was no budgetary provision. We knew vaguely where we were headed, but had no idea how to get there. It was a bit like heading off in a small aircraft for some distant destination without maps or charts, uncertain of the weather although aware that there were storms brewing on the horizon.

And yet we achieved a great deal in that first meeting, defining the program and setting objectives which are relevant to-day, 21 years later. Our first task was to define the purpose of the program, as we saw it. After innumerable drafts, there emerged a Statement of Purpose adopted by the board, which read:-

The purpose of the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program of Rotary International is to improve health, alleviate hunger, and enhance human and social development of all peoples as a means of advancing international understanding, goodwill and peace.

To achieve this purpose, Rotary clubs and individual Rotarians are encouraged to demonstrate a spirit of caring by undertaking projects in the fields of:

- 1) Health - to prevent or reduce disability and to improve the mental and physical well-being of people.
- 2) Hunger - to increase the production and improve the distribution of food, and to provide for higher levels of nutrition; and
- 3) Humanity - to enhance the educational, social, cultural, environmental, vocational, and spiritual qualities of life.

That was the blueprint. The structure had yet to be built, and that would involve many meetings and the labour of hundreds of devoted builders. But first, there were some house-keeping matters to be attended to; and so the committee made recommendations, adopted by the board, on a range of issues –

- Operational procedures to conduct a major immunisation project (drawing upon the experience of FAIM projects in Papua New Guinea).
- Funding of major projects – by whom, and for what?
- Production of promotional brochures, slide program and leaflets – budgeted cost \$60,500
- Recognising 1979 to be the "International Year of the Child", encouraging initial attention to the needs of children, adopting the motto "ROTARY CARES – for the Child"
- Authorising ordering 1000 banners for clubs contributing \$15 per member, and 500 plaques for clubs contributing \$30 per member
- Agreeing that a 3H program function be established at the secretariat.
- Deciding to proceed with the development and implementation of up to three immunisation projects or other projects.
- Appropriating \$100,000 in the R.I. Budget for 1978-79, to be re-imbursed from the 75th Anniversary Fund.

I have mentioned these in some detail to indicate that the committee really was starting from scratch – rather like a young married couple setting up house, without pots and pans, linen, furniture, carpets and drapes, having to borrow the money to get started, and against the wishes of the older generation (the in-laws;) but with hope and faith in the future.

Shortly after this meeting, realising the importance of getting information across to Rotarians worldwide, I was interviewed by a member of the staff of *The Rotarian*, the result published in the October, 1978 issues of *The Rotarian* and regional magazines. For most, this was the first real information they had on the program. As you read the report of this interview, try to imagine the impact on an audience on which the whole idea was foreign to their Rotary experience. And realise that this was at a time when we had no one on staff to handle the program

– hence the workload to be placed upon the committee and the board. This changed later, as it had to, with the flow of applications for projects.

THE ROTARIAN: President Renouf, just what is the Health, Hunger and Humanity program, and what is Rotary's function in its development?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: The purpose is to improve health, alleviate hunger, and enhance human and social development of people around the world. To achieve this purpose, the 3H committee is encouraging Rotary clubs everywhere to undertake projects to prevent or reduce communicable diseases and disabilities resulting from malnutrition; hunger projects, to increase the production and improve the handling and distribution of food; and humanity projects, to raise the educational, social, cultural, environmental, vocational and spiritual level.

THE ROTARIAN: How is the program being presented and explained?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: It will be a subject this year for presentation and discussion at the 16 zone and regional institutes for past, present and incoming officers. The committee is asking district governors and other Rotary leaders to introduce it in their official addresses. We are asking each governor to appoint a 3H committee for his district and to request each club to appoint a Health, Hunger and Humanity committee. The governor will also ask each club how it can support the aims of the program on the local level.

THE ROTARIAN: Where does a club start?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: Initially, Rotary clubs and their individual members will be asked to concentrate their attention on the needs of children. The program ties into a worldwide effort sponsored by the United Nations to observe 1979 as the "International Year of the Child".

THE ROTARIAN: Suppose clubs or individual Rotarians are aware of a particular need. What do they do about it? Do they report to the district governor, or to a member of the 3H committee, or to a special office at the R.I. secretariat?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: That will depend upon the type and scope of the project. If, for instance, it can be completed by a club, then the club may undertake it. If it is considered capable of completion by a district, then it would be referred to the

district governor. If considered too large for a club or district, it would be referred to the R.I. secretariat.

THE ROTARIAN: What will happen when a project (or possible project) is referred to the R.I. secretariat?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: It will be referred to the R.I. committee for evaluation and assessment. This committee, comprising experts in each of the fields of health, hunger and human and social development, and with access to other agencies, will be in a position to examine, assess and determine priorities.

THE ROTARIAN: Once the committee has determined the worthiness of a particular project, how will it be carried out?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: An application will first be made to the executive committee of the board of R.I. for approval and the allocation of funds. This application will describe the project, assess its benefits, and estimate its requirements in terms of manpower and funds. I would think that if the executive committee approved a project in principle, it would initially release only sufficient funds to enable a detailed on-the-spot assessment of the proposal – perhaps the fares and costs of a qualified person to visit the area, make contacts with the relevant authorities, seek the co-operation of nearby Rotary clubs, and prepare a more detailed estimate of the funds and manpower required to complete the project. If this confirms the initial application, the executive committee may then approve the allocation of funds required to complete the project.

THE ROTARIAN: Who would be responsible for the supervision of a particular project? Who would exercise control over the expenditure of funds?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: We haven't yet determined detailed operating procedures, but I would think it likely that we would find a Rotarian volunteer prepared to devote his time to the supervision and control of a particular project, with funds being released from the secretariat on properly authorized and documented procedures – for example, an imprest account, reimbursed on production of evidence of payment.

THE ROTARIAN: This may well require many months (even years) of voluntary work by a Rotarian. Do you think this is possible, in a purely voluntary capacity?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: I have no doubt about it. Young people

are volunteering two or three years of their lives to serve in foreign lands. I know there are many Rotarians ready and willing to serve in this way. They are already doing it – but in isolated and unrelated projects.

THE ROTARIAN: You say there are already many Rotarians serving in isolated and unrelated projects. Are you suggesting that the 3H program may substitute one large program for a number of isolated and unrelated projects?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: Yes, I think it may. I know, just from my limited knowledge and contacts, that many Rotarians and Rotary Clubs are presently engaged in small projects of the type we could undertake, but on a much larger scale. Because of the limitations of funds and manpower, they are of necessity small, scattered and localized. The 3H program will treat problems that need the combined efforts of individuals, clubs and districts.

THE ROTARIAN: Why do you think one big project, confined to one area, will be more effective than a number of smaller projects spread around the world?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: For much the same reason as one powerful cannon is more effective against heavy fortifications than a thousand shotguns. We would concentrate our resources, and we would be better organised.

THE ROTARIAN: You have made reference to the concept of a worldwide program. In the past Rotary International has not participated in "corporate" projects. Does this represent some kind of departure from past practice?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: Not really. This is a program designed to facilitate the involvement of Rotarians and Rotary clubs in large projects otherwise inaccessible to them. The real work will still be done at the local level, but it will be co-ordinated and facilitated under this program. It will in no way challenge the autonomy of the individual Rotary club, or be contrary to existing policy. It will give to every Rotarian and to every Rotary club the opportunity, but not the obligation, to be part of a worldwide program. I hope we never reach the stage in the development of our organization when we are afraid to try some new idea because it is new, or are afraid to reach even further than we have ever reached before.

THE ROTARIAN: You said earlier that initially we will be

asked to concentrate on the needs of children. In what way will sick, hungry, or otherwise needy adults benefit?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: The reason for concentrating initially on children is that in their early years sickness and malnutrition can have such devastating and permanent effects. This is when humans are most vulnerable. This is when "their bones are being developed". Many of the sacrifices parents make for their children would be unnecessary if we could eliminate hunger and disease, and could substitute hope for despair.

THE ROTARIAN: When will this program actually begin?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: It has already begun. The 3H committee is right now investigating possible areas of need, in consultation with the World Health Organization. But there is a great deal to be done before the first Rotarian will be asked to volunteer his services. It will be slow in starting . . . and of course we have very little money just yet - but I am not concerned on that score. I know it will come.

THE ROTARIAN: Why are you so confident?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: Because Rotarians have already demonstrated their willingness to support worthwhile projects. In my early contacts with Rotarians I have found great enthusiasm for the concept of a worldwide program of this magnitude - and the funds are already coming in.

THE ROTARIAN: What effect will financial support of the 3H program have on contributions to The Rotary Foundation, in your opinion?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: I can appreciate that this question is asked, because, after all, the potential for the 75th Anniversary Fund, if fully supported, is \$12 million. However, I believe Rotarians will continue their high level of support for the Foundation programs, which comes principally from personal contributions of individual Rotarians. We are urging Rotary clubs to raise funds for the 3H program through a special project such as a theatre night, civic event, or other service effort. For each club, such a project could form an important part of the 75th anniversary observance of Rotary.

THE ROTARIAN: Will the 3H projects be simply "aid" projects, or will they be educational as well, teaching practical f o o d - growing techniques, health and sanitation measures, and the

like.

PRESIDENT RENOUF: They will not be merely "aid" projects. They will seek to prevent disease rather than just to cure it, and especially to encourage self-help rather than charity.

THE ROTARIAN: You have already spoken at a number of Rotary meetings, and have had contact in other ways with many Rotarians. What has been their reaction to this new program?

PRESIDENT RENOUF: If I were asked to describe it in one word I would say "enthusiastic". I believe there is a realisation that we have now reached the time when we need to marshal our scattered resources and commit them to a program which will demonstrate our concern with some of the pressing problems of our time and our ability to help solve them. In the Health, Hunger and Humanity program we have that opportunity, with an organisation big enough to make an impact that will be visible and significant, and yet not too big to exclude the personal participation of our members.

Our most urgent task will be, not to generate enthusiasm (that is already evident), but to develop the organizational structure of the program to the point where that enthusiasm can find practical expression. We are pressing on with this, utilizing the resources of a cooperative staff at the secretariat, a knowledgeable and hard-working committee, and a board committed to a program which will demonstrate, in the Year of the Child, that "Rotary cares . . . for the child."

The next meeting of the 3H committee was in February, 1979, when it had more weighty items on the agenda:

- The question of incorporation as a tax-exempt charitable organisation.
- An in principle decision to proceed in the Philippines with a polio immunisation project at a cost of \$760,000. We then had \$161,812 in the bank, but were prepared to spend almost five times that amount on our first project, such was our faith in the future of the program.
- The desirability of establishing special interest groups (e.g. teams of physicians, dentists, agricultural specialists, educators etc.) to participate in the planning or development of major 3H projects.

The composition of future 3H committees.

What I said to various meetings as I travelled the Rotary world that year was being constantly modified in the light of new developments. Although our 3H Committee met as early as 10 July, 1978, there was not yet much evidence in the field of program development; so I sought to explain that and (in the absence of explanatory literature) the objectives of the program.

I dealt with the 'corporate activity' controversy. I tried to paint an optimistic picture of financial support at a time when it was actually very meagre, but looked like improving. And I tied in with the United Nations International Year of the Child, which was an international focus very relevant to the 3H program

Here, by way of example, is an extract from a speech I made to the CENAEM Institute in Paris in December, 1978 attended by Rotarians from Central Europe, North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean.

This was almost half way through my year in office. It indicates the extent to which the program had been developed after almost six months, and my perception of it at that time:-

Traditionally we have been involved in a multiplicity of projects, each of them important, each of them meeting a local need, but none of them big enough to make an impact upon major areas of world need. Perhaps we could achieve more, and be drawn closer together, if we were to marshal our scattered resources and commit them to a common program of major proportions, involving in the one major project the participation of the people of many countries. This year we have that opportunity in the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program of Rotary International - a program which will bring a new dimension to our service activities, and a new vitality to existing programs such as World Community Service, through the p e r s o n a l contacts it will generate.

Initially, we will be involved in an immunisation program in one of the developing countries of the world - perhaps in Asia, or Africa, or South America, perhaps in all three areas, if we

have enough money and enough faith. The board has appropriated an amount of \$100,000 to enable the initial project to proceed, this amount to be repaid by the 75th Anniversary Fund as money becomes available.

Inevitably, as we become engaged in an immunisation program, we will be confronted with a whole range of human needs, and there will be opportunities for Rotarians, contributing their skills and experience and time, to grapple with t h e problems of malnutrition and illiteracy and inadequate housing. The personal participation of Rotarians is of paramount importance; for the fundamental thrust of this program is to create understanding, not just to provide health services and amenities. It is not a money program. It is a person to person program, tackling tasks too big for any one club or any one district, and yet available even to the smallest club and the individual Rotarian.

It is one in which any club may choose to be involved, or not to be involved - in the same way as it may choose to be involved, or not to be involved, in the other worldwide program so well known to us all - The Rotary Foundation. [Note - the principal opponents of the program were, or had recently been, Trustees of The Rotary Foundation.]

As you are aware, concurrently with the announcement at Tokyo of the new program, the board also announced the establishment of the 75th Anniversary Fund for the development of the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program. We are asking every Rotary club to consider a contribution to this fund, prior to 30 June, 1980, of an amount equivalent to \$15 per member. That would give us a total of about \$12 million.

Those clubs which contribute \$15 per member or \$1,500 will receive special recognition, in the form of a banner depicting the logo of the program. A plaque, individually engraved, will be presented to clubs which contribute \$30 or more per member. Already there are several of them.

I know the response will be generous, as Rotarians realise the potential in this new program which will reach out around the world to give new life and meaning and purpose to the fourth avenue of service.

Do you know that in 21 countries in the ANZAO region we have only one Rotary club; and in 10 additional countries only two clubs – most of them in Africa? If we are to retain our toe-hold in some of those countries in which we are at present so thinly spread; if we are to maintain our strength in some of those countries in which ideologies unsympathetic to our cause are gaining strength; if we are to build for the future – we need to be known better than we are for what we stand for.

As an organisation, we need to be recognised world-wide as one which is concerned about people and their needs, and we need to express that concern in concrete, visible and significant programs at home and abroad. This is critical, not only to our continued growth, but to our very survival in many countries of the world.

Let us then commemorate the 75th Anniversary of Rotary International by investing a little of our money, so that those who are able can invest their time and talent and concern, reaching out to others to get closer to them, building bridges of friendship and understanding as we seek to draw the people of the world closer together.

This is an abridged version of the message I was giving about that time as I attended meetings around the world. So far as I could gauge it, there was substantial support for the 3H idea, despite the lack of any real evidence yet that it would work. We still had a long way to go.

But the May-June 1979 meeting of the board we received a status report from the 3H committee (Item 346) which indicated that it had met three times at the secretariat, culminating in a recommendation to the board, in consequence of which the board agreed (Item 347) that:-

a) the polio immunization project described as Project 1, Stage II of the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program in the Philippines be implemented, in co-operation with the world Health Organization and the Philippine Ministry of Health; and

b) in accordance with discussion at this meeting, up to \$760,000 of the 75th Anniversary Fund be expended for a five-year immunization program for the purchase of polio vaccines, travel and other costs for additional supervisory

activities and training.

At last we were launched, on a scale never before contemplated or attempted. Here, in the minds of many of us was the justification for the 3H program – the pooling of the resources of large numbers of clubs to carry out a project beyond the capacity of any one of them or any group of them, for the benefit of large numbers of people – more than six million children. Pooling the money was the least part of the problem. A large project such as this called for a great deal of organisation just to get it started, only possible through and by some centralised administrative structure.

I have glossed over the detailed work carried out by the committee over the preceding several months, in the later stages with the assistance of John Stucky, recently appointed to the staff to direct his energies exclusively to the development of the 3H program and its projects. And the Philippines Rotarians themselves played a prominent and active part in bringing the project to fruition – especially PDG. Dr. Benny Santos, and Dr. Elpidio Valencia, a member of the Rotary Club of Malolos, and a former Secretary of Health. Their well documented proposal reached the 3H committee just two days before it met to decide where the first immunisation project would be.

In March, 1979 I had met in Manila with representatives of the Philippines Ministry of Health, to conclude certain agreements required before we could formally decide to proceed with our first project, including a "hold harmless" agreement indemnifying R.I. against any claims against it resulting from the project. It was an historic moment, with representatives of the Ministry of Health, Rotary, WHO and UNICEF present, for we were not only committing ourselves to the expenditure of substantial Rotary funds on a project the like of which we had never previously undertaken – in our alliance with agencies of United Nations we were putting Rotary's reputation on the line for all to see.

It was an historic moment too, in another sense (although none of us knew it at the time) for this was the start of a long and productive partnership with WHO and UNICEF, and the first step in a long journey which would see the world free of polio

by the turn of the century.

At that meeting I had suggested to Dr. Benny Santos that the polio immunisation project could be just the first of a whole range of 3H projects, designed to cover each of the aspects of the program. My idea was that we would concentrate on, say, one barrio or one province. We would gather comprehensive statistics on every aspect of life in that administrative area, as I had seen done several years earlier in a village development project in India. We would then embark on a series of projects, aimed at lifting the living standards of the people of that area – in health, hygiene, education, agriculture, literacy, vocational training and the development of business skills. Then, after say three or five years, we would do another survey and, comparing those results with the base-line study done before commencing the project, measure our success (or otherwise).

I saw this as an opportunity to use the services of large numbers of international volunteers in a whole range of skills – and a demonstration to governments and aid agencies of what could be achieved when Rotary brought to bear on a problem a whole range of resources – manpower, money and an organisational structure to provide administrative continuity.

But Benny Santos counselled against the idea – not necessarily because he held reservations about its viability, but because he believed it would be detrimental to the 3H program as a whole if there was undue concentration on the needs of any one country. It was typical of his generosity – and of his judgment; for I'm sure he was right. As the program progressed, it became apparent that we could never have sufficient funds to satisfy all the needs presented to us, and that purely from a political point of view we needed to spread our resources equitably around the Rotary world to which we looked for support.

Another incident occurred at that meeting which demonstrated our ability as an organisation to attract donated vaccines, and to distribute them to maximum effect. In the course of the meeting I received a telegram from Evanston (no faxes in those days !), informing me that we had been offered about 700,000 doses of tetanus toxoid vaccine, and enquiring whether it could be used in the Philippines. I handed the note to

Dr. Valencia, who checked with Dr. J. Dizon (representing the Ministry of Health). Turning to me he said "President Clem, this is literally an answer to prayer. We have an enormous need of tetanus toxoid vaccine in the Philippines right now."

In fact, on that very day (Friday 2nd March, 1979) Teodoro F. Valencia, a columnist wrote in The Philippines Daily Express:

The newspapers, radio and TV must conduct information campaigns to inform people about the dangers of tetanus and how to avoid it, how to give first aid to victims. Too many people die of tetanus without even a chance of being administered medicine. The drug is too expensive for the poor.

And here we were being offered it free, because we were trusted and respected.

So I telegraphed back and ordered it. On 14th March, 1979 (in less than 14 days) the Minister of Health received a total of 683,870 doses. They were promptly distributed throughout the country to provide immunity to the children of pregnant women and high risk adults – entirely at no cost to Rotary, the vaccines having been donated, the airlines having flown them in free of cost, and the distribution having been made through the regular channels of the Expanded Program on Immunisation.

It was at this critical stage in the development of the program, with a very desirable project about to be launched and funds starting to flow in freely, that the discovery was made by legal counsel that the money contributed to the 75th Anniversary Fund could not be held by the board, but by the trustees. So here we were at crisis point – the board with a project, but no access to the money which had been contributed for that purpose, the trustees with the money, but no project on which they were obliged to spend it, and a majority (but not all) of them reluctant to be involved in the 3H program.

The fact that our board had earlier given notice to the trustees that it intended to move at the next council on legislation to reduce the number of past presidents from six to five (so that they would no longer be in the majority) did not

help matters. (This decision was later changed, after negotiation, to provide for the number of trustees to be increased to thirteen, six of whom would continue to be past presidents).

Against this background, in a rather lengthy decision the board at its May-June, 1979 meeting (Item 349) suggested to the trustees that they receive and hold the funds earmarked for the 3H program, but authorise the executive committee of the board to operate the program under contract.

It was a delicate situation, occurring right near the end of the Rotary year, with changes in the composition of both the board and the trustees about to take place. Would the trustees agree to what seemed to us (with the benefit of advice from legal counsel) to be the only practical solution to the dilemma, or would they reject it and in the process jeopardise the whole 3H program?

Fortunately, they responded promptly, meeting in Rome, during the period of the convention, and adopted the following statement, which held out some hope of compromise, and (very importantly) a desire to try to solve some of those "other matters" which were causing friction between the two organisations; for they were separate organisations, growing apart.

The trustees express a desire to deal with the possible involvement of The Rotary Foundation with the Health, Hunger and Humanity program and other matters regarding the relationship of The Rotary Foundation to Rotary International and authorize the incoming chairman of the trustees to appoint an ad hoc committee to be composed of not less than three nor more than five members, at least three of whom shall be Foundation trustees, to work with the board of directors of R.I. toward a possible solution.

III

I cleared my desk in the President's office on 30th June, 1979 and left for home, uncertain of the fate of the program to which I had devoted so much of my time and energy. I didn't have to wait long. I had been home less than two weeks when I received a call from Past President Imbassahy de Mello, the new chairman of trustees, asking me to come to Evanston almost immediately for a meeting between the board and the trustees. I was by now, of course, a trustee.

It was a productive two day meeting, chaired by Director Herb Brown, with other board members being R.I. President Jim Bomar, and Directors Don Kwait and Art Richardson. Trustee members were Ernesto Imbassahy-de-Mello (chairman), Past Director Mike Pedrick and Past Presidents Jack Davis, Bill Robbins and Clem Renouf.

A letter dated 24th July, 1979 addressed to the Chairman of the Board of Directors of R.I. and the Chairman of the Trustees of The Rotary Foundation, signed by each of the abovenamed, indicated their unanimous endorsement of the recommendations contained in the accompanying report, which were subsequently approved by both the board and the trustees in a ballot by mail.

With a view to providing a complete historical record of that very important meeting, I am tempted to include here the full three-page text of those recommendations, but I think they can be accurately summarised, in more readable form as follows -

1. The 3H program, previously a program of the board, now to become a program of The Rotary Foundation, and to be known as "Grants for the Health, Hunger and Humanity program".

2. The trustees to make grants not to exceed the total of funds specifically contributed for 3H projects, which met eight specified criteria.

3. The board to be responsible for the operation and completion of the project, subject to approval of applications

for funding by the trustees.

4. Contributions to the 75th Anniversary Fund not to be applied to qualify for recognition of club percentage plateaus, Paul Harris Fellows or Paul Harris Sustaining Members.

5. A joint committee (five from each body) to be appointed annually to meet not less often than annually during the first half of the Rotary year, to discuss any aspect of the relationship between the board and the trustees, and to review other matters of mutual interest, for recommendation and report to their respective bodies.

The recommendations summarised in 1 to 3 above provided the key to unlock the deadlock which threatened the operation of the 3H program. In the short term they were vital. But number 5 was of greater significance in the long term. Here was a mechanism for regular face to face meetings of representatives of the two bodies, not only for the purpose of dealing with any misunderstandings, but importantly for sharing ideas and plans for the future.

It was fortunate that Past President Imbassahy de-Mello came to the chairmanship of the trustees when he did – and I say that with no disrespect to any other trustee. He was a lawyer from Brazil, highly principled, strongly in favour of the 3H program, but with a firm determination to heal the rift which had developed between the R.I. Board and its Foundation Trustees. As the architect of a Statement of Relationship between the two controlling bodies he did much to create the harmony which characterises their relationship to-day. And Jim Bomar, my successor in office, proved equally effective in explaining, defending and promoting the 3H program. At the same time, a campaign was being vigorously waged by its opponents; so that, to an extent I had never previously known, Rotarians were being challenged at the grass roots level to decide whether this would be a good thing for Rotary, or detrimental to its future and contrary to its ideals and philosophy.

Of course, this was a period in which Rotary's leadership was changing, around the world, at every level. The vital link in that chain of command was the district governor. The International Assembly at Boca Raton, Florida, 31 May-7 June, 1979 was therefore an incomparable opportunity to tell the 3H story to those who would make the greatest impact at the grass

roots level – Jim Bomar's team of governors for 1979-80; and, incidentally, those who would carry much of the burden of defending it during that critical time.

Accordingly, I asked Cliff Dochterman, to make the presentation to the Assembly, for I knew he was not only knowledgeable about the program (he was one of the three Co-chairmen of the International 3H Committee), but also enthusiastic about it, with the ability to convey that enthusiasm to his audience. Today, 20 years later, much of what he said may seem to have been very basic. But these were early years, with doubts being sown, and misinformation being disseminated; and it needed someone with Cliff's ability to inform and inspire. (In the interests of space I have omitted from the following edited version of his address some of those basic facts now well known.)

After detailing areas of human need with which the program would be concerned (sickness, hunger, unemployment, hopelessness, violence, ignorance, prejudice) he went on to say:-

It is the basic concern for the health and welfare of other human beings that led to the creation of the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program. This expression of Rotary is a program which provides our most far-reaching endeavor ever designed to advance international understanding, goodwill and peace. It is our objective through the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program to participate as we improve health, alleviate hunger, and enhance the human, cultural and social development of all peoples.

Rotary, as you know, has had a history of service for nearly 75 years. We know how Rotarians, Rotary clubs and Rotary districts have conducted thousands of projects to help in their community and throughout the world. Through the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program, clubs and districts will continue to serve others in significant projects which demonstrate that Rotarians care about disease, poverty, hunger, and other human needs.

The 3H program combines with the great variety of activities of Rotary and does not substitute for any of our existing programs. Actually the 3H Program may stimulate new activ-

ity in many areas of club or individual service. For example, a local Rotary club project which helps a crippled children's school or which assists in meeting the needs of those with mental or emotional illness is a 3H project. Likewise, a project by a Rotary club which increases food production or the distribution of food to those who are hungry is also considered a 3H project . . . The thrust of the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program will actually give many club committees a new reason to consider urgent human needs which are calling for the service and involvement of Rotarians.

Through the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program, Rotary is now developing the mechanism or processes through which the resources, manpower, expert knowledge and the great prestige of Rotary enable us to undertake projects which never before were possible.

For example, it is unlikely that any Rotary club, or even a group of Rotary clubs, would ever be able to undertake a massive project to immunise the children of an entire developing nation and then set up the permanent mechanism to see that the program would be continued for future generations of children. But with the 3H program it may be possible to take the resources of international health agencies, local governments, medical missionary programs, and other groups and combine them with the tremendous talent, knowledge and personal resources of 830,000 Rotarians to solve a critical health problem.

The potential of the program is beyond our most imaginative dreams. The beauty of the program is that it gives Rotary a process by which the hands of thousands of Rotarians can reach out to serve real human needs.

The 3H program is introducing a new dimension to Rotary service at the international level. We now have a program which gives Rotarians an opportunity to take part in a global or regional project which has worldwide consequences. The 3H committee, with the expert support of the secretariat staff, will be able to do the necessary planning, investigation, co-ordination, securing equipment and to complete all the other preliminary tasks required for a major international project . . . As Rotarians enrich the lives of other human beings, we will

be taking one step closer to our goal of world understanding, goodwill and peace.

A secondary benefit of the 3H program can be the strengthened image that Rotary will project throughout the world. As we move forward with visible 3H projects, Rotary's concern about the condition of human beings will become increasingly apparent. As we put service into worldwide action, the name of Rotary will become recognised to a greater extent than it presently is as the international organisation which uses the personal involvement of its members to meet pressing needs of the sick, hungry, and downtrodden wherever they may be.

In the coming year the world will judge Rotary's 75th anniversary by what we have done. But as Rotarians we must judge ourselves by those things we are capable of doing. If we can achieve our objectives of the 3H program, the world will have a totally new understanding of the meaning of Rotary.

He then went on to deal with the areas of concern the Board of R.I. would be targeting, the financial resources which would be required, and the intention to expend the fund over a five year period (a policy later changed and endorsed by the 1980 council on legislation, as reported elsewhere). Then he concluded with a typical Cliff Dochterman call to action:-

Fellow Rotarians, the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program is an exciting challenge. It is the brilliant sunrise of a new dawn for Rotary. It gives new meaning to the words "service above self". In this year of the child, let us lead the way to stamp out disease, Let us fill the bowl of a child who cries out for food. Let us wipe away the tears from the cheeks of a frightened child. Let us breathe new hope into the lives of parents around the world.

The Health, Hunger and Humanity Program is an extension of Rotary's mission of service. Let us tell the world by our deeds that Rotary Cares. Let us plant this message in the hearts and minds of 830,000 Rotarians so that it will contribute to our goal of advancing world understanding, goodwill and peace for generations to come.

"The brilliant sunrise of a new dawn for Rotary." That was

exactly the message for the new team of district leaders, about to scatter around the world – a world yet to be convinced.

Alfred North Whitehead (in the statement attributed to him at the beginning of this book) describes perfectly the dilemma facing thousands of Rotarians at that time – some bent on the discovery of a new world, others haunted by the dim sound of the breakers dashing on the rocks ahead.

Undeterred, the board and the 3H committee continued to promote the program and publicise its activities, with a series of "3H Reports". Here are some extracts from Report No. 2 dated February, 1980:

- The R.I. Board of Directors at its November meeting approved a two-year program to send more than 200 Rotarian volunteer physicians to Southeast Asian refugee camps to help alleviate suffering and prepare refugees waiting for repatriation to other countries. The board appropriated \$US 600,000 from the 75th Anniversary Fund to cover travel and basic living expenses of doctor teams at the camps, most of them located in Hong Kong, Thailand and Malaysia.

- Next in demand are radiologists, parasitologists, and those with knowledge of tropical diseases. Teams of four doctors will go out each month during the two-year program, but many more volunteers are needed. Doctors who can give a month or more of their time should fill out application forms.

- Long-range 3H goal: The eradication of poliomyelitis and the alleviation of its crippling effects throughout the world has been given priority by the R.I. Board. The recently-initiated polio immunisation program in the Philippines has set the pace.

- Vaccines for Costa Rica – R.I.'s 3H program, in co-operation with the Costa Rican Ministry of Health, delivered 48,000 doses of tetanus toxoid vaccine and 490 injectable polio vaccine doses to San Jose on 15 November. Connaught Laboratories donated the vaccines, airfreight from Miami was provided free of charge by LACSA (Costa Rica) Airlines.

- The Rotary Club of Treviglio e della Pianura Bergamasca, Italy, is sending 500,000 doses of Sabin polio oral vaccine to the Philippines for the R.I. polio immunisation project there. The club was chartered in March 1979.

- More than \$US 3 million has been contributed to the 75th Anniversary Fund for the Development of R.I.'s 3H program.

Today, measured against the magnitude of subsequent developments and major projects, these may seem insignificant; but it was important, at that critical stage early in the program's development, to share with the Rotary world evidence of the direction in which it was headed, and a sense of optimism – and there was mounting evidence that this was happening. For example, the Rotary Club of Didsbury (England) produced a special 75th Anniversary edition of its club bulletin, obviously intended for general distribution to the public, which focused on the 3H program.

When I paid a quick visit to Australia in December, 1978, District Governor Reg Pain lined up the president of every club in the district to be presented with a banner in recognition of support to the extent of at least \$15 per member or \$1,000 per club

Jim Bomar's assessment of the position, as he travelled extensively as president throughout the Rotary world and met and talked with large numbers of Rotarians, was that there was overwhelming support for the program – not just for a limited five year program, as originally planned, but for it to continue as an established, ongoing activity of The Rotary Foundation.

So he approached the trustees, on behalf of the board, and sought their concurrence in submitting to the 1980 Council on Legislation a proposal to give effect to this. Resolution 80-120, passed by the council, effectively established the 3H program as an ongoing activity of The Rotary Foundation, although it was still subject to continuing and mounting challenge from its opponents.

In essence, Resolution 80-120, adopted by the 1980 Council on Legislation:-

- requested the board to continue to develop and implement effective 3H projects;

- authorised the use of funds contributed for that purpose, and such additional funds as appropriated by the trustees and approved by the board from the general funds of the Foundation;

- required an annual report to all clubs concerning

achievements of the program and its finances;

- required the board in co-operation with the trustees to develop a suggested course of action of the 3H program concerning its achievements, the involvement of Rotarians and the potential contributions to the objective of R.I. and The Foundation.

The passage of 80-120 was the signal to those opposed to the program to intensify their efforts in the hope of having that decision reversed. At the convention in Dallas in 1982, Past President Jim Conway launched a determined challenge to the program, but it was too late. The Rotary world had by now caught a vision of what could be accomplished, working together to try to meet some of the needs of a needy world.

The Struggle Intensifies

Undeterred, they continued their campaign in the hope of having Resolution 80-120 reversed at the next Council on Legislation in Monaco in 1983. It was to be a titanic struggle, each side convinced it was right, and prepared to do whatever was necessary to persuade others to its point of view. It involved not so much a clash of personalities (although that emerged) as a clash of fundamentally different philosophies.

Those opposed to the program saw it as a direct challenge to what they genuinely believed to be Rotary's purpose, as envisaged by Paul Harris when he founded it 75 years earlier, and as endorsed in subsequent decisions of boards over the intervening years. For them Rotary was a locally-based organisation of business and community leaders concerned primarily with the welfare of their local communities. It was the responsibility of governments to take care of those major issues with which 3H was becoming involved. They were not uncaring. They just didn't believe that Rotary, as an organisation, should be involved. And because it was locally-based and locally-focused, it was inappropriate for clubs to join together to tackle tasks beyond their own local communities.

The proponents of the 3H program, on the other hand, saw this as an opportunity to use the resources of a growing organisation to help others beyond their local communities, and to undertake tasks which it was incapable of doing under exist-

ing guidelines. They believed that policies which were relevant when Rotary was founded were no longer appropriate in a world which had changed vastly in 75 years; that changes in technology and communication, which had heightened awareness of the needs of people in the third world, provided both the challenge and the opportunity to marshal our scattered resources and commit them to major projects beyond the capacity of any one club or district, and in so doing to enhance our efforts to create a more tolerant, more peaceful world.

So the battle lines were drawn - on one hand a small but powerful group of very senior past officers opposing a project which they perceived as a threat to the autonomy of the individual club (a principle in which they believed passionately) and on the other the current leadership, committed just as passionately to changing policies which they believed restricted the organisation's capacity to reach its full potential, without any threat to the autonomy of individual clubs.

In a letter to all board members and trustees (and others) on 28 July, 1980, Jim Conway set forth his concerns regarding resolution 80-120, focusing in the opening paragraph on what appeared to be his principal worry. It read:

The clause in this resolution that requests the utilisation of "such additional funds as may be appropriated by the trustees and approved by the board from the general funds of The Rotary Foundation" is causing alarm in many places. Fear has been expressed . . . that the funds of the Foundation will be diverted from the development of leaders and ambassadors of goodwill, and that the flow of monies contributed for education awards and special grants (as originally conceived) will be diluted to provide for these 3H programs.

It was a long letter, too long to be quoted here. I chose to reply specifically to three of the points he had made -

1. He said that resolution 80/120 did not command that the trustees do anything - and I agreed that the trustees and the board were under no legal or constitutional obligation to seek the approval of the Council on Legislation for the funding of the 3H program.

"Why did they take it to the Council?" I asked. "I cannot speak for others, but I believe I echo the opinion of many of them in stating that I was aware (as I'm sure you are) of a concerted effort to stifle the program, and it therefore appeared appropriate and prudent to have the joint proposal submitted to the scrutiny and judgment of the Council on Legislation."

2. He said that we might use the general funds of the Foundation with resulting detriment to existing Foundation programs. I pointed out that until 30 June, 1982, funds had been budgeted for all existing programs (other than 3H), and that the 3H program would not be funded from the general funds of The Foundation until after 30 June, 1982.

"Of course," I said, "any expenditure on any new program must diminish the amount available for existing programs. Are you suggesting we should never have any new programs under The Rotary Foundation?"

3. His third concern was expressed in the words: "As a trustee of The Foundation you have a higher obligation to protect the funds for the purposes for which they were contributed than to pay heed to a suggestion which runs counter to all of the programs promoted by The Foundation except relief to war afflicted Rotarians."

Like so many at the time who believed that (apart from Special Grants) The Rotary Foundation existed exclusively for the Scholarships program, Jim opposed the introduction of any new major program which would compete for funding.

I pointed out that the very purpose of resolution 80/120 was to seek the endorsement of Rotary's most representative decision-making body to the proposal to expend future contributions on a new and tested program. "Are you really inferring," I asked, "that because this program is different from our traditional programs, the trustees are failing in their duty and high responsibility in supporting a program of the Board of R.I.?"

And then I resorted to quoting some historical background to support my argument, in these words:-

"As an incoming governor at the convention at Atlantic City in 1965 I heard Joe Abey, as chairman of the trustees, announce the trustees' intention to explore new ways and develop new and broader programs. Here are a couple of typical

statements, as reported on pages 139-143 of the record of proceedings:-

We have carried on a world-wide search for new activities of the Rotary Foundation.

Many people think that the only purpose of The Rotary Foundation is to offer opportunities for advanced study for young people. This is not so . . . Somewhere, somehow, we may discover and develop an idea that will raise the Foundation to the pinnacle of success . . . so that people around the world will point with pride to our accomplishments and say: 'There is Rotary working, advancing to new heights.

"Again, when Walter H. Davis asked: 'Does The Rotary Foundation have the power for expansion into fields of health and agriculture, as previously mentioned?' President Pettingill replied 'There is nothing to preclude expansion; in fact, it is intended that the program of The Rotary Foundation shall be expanded'.

"These were undertakings given to the Rotarians of the world at their annual convention, and I have never forgotten them. I believed they were statements of intention. Now, as a trustee, I believe I have an obligation to try to give effect to them.

"Before I close, permit me a personal observation. I believe very strongly that The Rotary Foundation is Rotary's greatest success story, and that as a trustee I have an obligation to do all in my power to enhance its greatness. But I also believe that we should be seeking new opportunities for service, particularly if they extend our horizon.

"I am disappointed then, when I hear of people (some of them men who have held high office in our organisation) condemning this new program, alleging that -

- it constitutes 'corporate action'; or
- it will 'kill the Foundation'; or
- The Foundation was never intended 'for projects in the villages of Africa, (as I once heard it expresses by a trustee); or
- we should not 'pay heed to a suggestion which runs counter to all of the programs promoted by the Foundation except relief to war afflicted Rotarians'."

During his term as R.I. president in 1969-70 Jim Conway's theme was "Review and Renew". I couldn't resist the tempta-

tion to remind him of it in these words:

"I am disappointed when I hear of people condemning this new program. On such occasions I take heart from the pen of a man who exhorted me to 'Review and Renew' with statements such as these: 'There are some clubs which are still content to plod on in the same rut. There is, in consequence, a dreadful danger of opportunities being lost. Too many people are in-betweeners. They are indifferent to the turbulence of our times. They shun the responsibility of being their brother's keeper although they profess a willingness to be their brother's keeper'."

This was not the last of our correspondence, but I finally concluded there would be no point in our continuing to exchange letters, distributed to other people, arguing fine points of semantics (for Jim was a lawyer, accustomed to using words and phrases to his advantage) when we had already declared our position on the matter, with little prospect of either of us changing our stance on fundamental issues.

"However," I wrote, "if you wish to continue the discussion privately, I am willing to do so. I would welcome it. But let us not place our friendship in jeopardy, for I have always held you in high regard, and still do. It would be the ultimate irony if, in our enthusiasm for the attainment of Rotary's goal of understanding, we were to create misunderstanding."

That concluded our letter writing. I didn't find it easy to argue with Jim Conway, with his keen legal mind, strongly held beliefs and an aggressive attitude. I respected him, and would have been more comfortable having him on my side than in opposition.

It was therefore encouraging to receive from Harold Thomas of Auckland (President of R.I. in 1959-60) a letter dated 17 August, 1980 which referred to what was apparently the first of Jim's letters seeking the support of influential Rotarians - past presidents and others, asking them to write to the Board and the Trustees.

In his letter Harold said, "I have received from Jim Conway a letter in which he says that he and George Togasaki are 'gravely concerned' about the possible consequences of the adoption of Resolution 80/120. Jim says he will be writing to both the Trustees and the Board and invites me 'if I agree with

him' to do likewise. And I assume Jim will have been in touch with some others, including the past presidents. Not wishing to become even semi-officially involved in opposition to either the Board or the Trustees (if it can be avoided) I am enclosing a copy of my reply to Jim so that you will know where I stand in case the question should be raised."

The enclosed copy of Harold's letter to Jim I found both supportive and informative, because he was able to draw upon his long experience at the top level of Rotary to remind Jim, and inform me, of earlier attitudes to change - and he did it in his customary gentlemanly manner. Here is what he wrote:-

Replying to your letter of July 21 re Resolution 80/120 I am afraid that once again you are going to be disappointed in my reaction, and so I begin with an assurance that I have always appreciated your deep-seated concern for the well-being of Rotary. But I wonder whether you are forgetting that when the original program of The Rotary Foundation was being hammered out, following the death of Paul Harris, the whole conception was strenuously opposed by those who felt that it was t o drastic a change from R.I.'s traditional policy of "not looking with favour" on corporate activities.

I argued then that to be alive is to be subject to continual change, and I would still argue that way today. So it is that I would be "gravely concerned" if Rotary showed signs of becoming static - unable or unwilling to meet changing times, changing needs and changing opportunities.

In this particular case my understanding is that the idea underlying 80/120 originated with the Trustees and was approved after full discussion during a joint session with the Board of R.I. Those are the ones who are carrying the responsibilities of office, including the responsibility of providing leadership in furthering the Purpose or Object of Rotary. They have all relevant information available to them. And my feeling is that from my position on the sideline it would be inappropriate for me to question the wisdom of their joint decision.

I am sorry, Jim, that we do not see eye to eye on this question. But of course we will be as one in hoping that when changes are being considered, wisdom will prevail.

Although the current leadership (the board and the trustees) had the authority to formulate policies and programs, in the final analysis their decisions were subject to the will of the membership at large, expressed through their delegates at the tri-ennial councils on legislation. So, in the period leading up to the 1983 council on legislation, there was a constant contest to persuade the Rotary world to the opposing points of view.

Probably never before or since have the constitutional documents of R.I. been so closely examined, in search of technical impediments to continuance of the program. Simultaneously, by direct mail to other Rotary leaders, speaking at strategic Rotary meetings, writing articles for publication in Regional Rotary Magazines – even (some of them) helping to organise a two day meeting of the so called Large Clubs in Chicago on 9-10 October, 1981, those opposing the program made a determined bid to persuade the membership at large to their viewpoint. Informed, influential and respected, they had the advantage that their opinions and arguments were not easily dismissed. They were credible advocates of their cause.

However, the board and the trustees had the advantage not only that they were in constant contact with clubs and district leaders, but also that, while the debate raged, they could publicise what the 3H program had already achieved. A summary report in May, 1982 announced that:

- 12,600,000 children would be immunised under grants already made totalling \$1,654,100, and more than 4,000,000 doses of donated vaccines had been supplied to 15 countries.

- 3,000,000 children in India had been protected against red measles.

- \$250,000 had been provided to establish a treatment and rehabilitation clinic for polio victims in Malawi.

- More than 110 Rotarian volunteers had served in 3H projects in 19 countries, especially in refugee, emergency and disaster areas.

- A \$361,200 grant had been made to fund an integrated regional health care system serving 300,000 people through village health care posts in Mali, and a similar project involving international volunteers to the Totonac Indians in Mexico, at

a cost of US\$222,000.

- Early malnutrition detection and prevention programs had been established in Guatemala and Thailand at a cost of \$425,700.

- 400 manually-operated tube wells had been supplied to farmers in Bangladesh to double or triple their crops through irrigation.

- Small farmers and mothers of malnourished rural children were receiving training in Honduras.

- A vocational training centre had been established in the Caribbean through two six-month vocational training schools.

- \$123,100 had been provided for the development of an adult literacy outreach program and strengthening of post-secondary vocational training programs in the Dominican Republic.

With proposals pending board and trustee approval, 3H project appropriations already totalled US\$6,340,975, with the 75th Anniversary Fund (including interest and designated contributions) forecast to be US\$9,256,499 by 30 June, 1992.

For the board and trustees this record of humanitarian aid to people in the third world, less than three years after the launch of the program, was evidence of the need of such a program if Rotary was to reach its potential as an international service organisation with a world view and mission.

For those opposed, it was evidence of how far we had strayed from what they believed to be our charter. They therefore seized every opportunity to create a political climate to persuade clubs, through their delegates to the council on legislation in Monaco, to kill the program.

Past R. I. President Jim Conway appeared to be the leader of the group, although I doubt they were formally constituted. He was just the one who was most vocal. Others at the vanguard of the opposition were Past R.I. Presidents Bill Robbins, Cliff Randall and Roy Hickman, and Past General Secretary George Means.

The General Secretary's letter of 19 November, 1980 (widely distributed throughout the Rotary world) dealt exclusively and comprehensively with the 3H program, and especially the

significance of the passage of Resolutions 80-120 and 80-114 (authorising the total amount of money which may be expended from the general fund [corpus] during the three year period beginning 1 July, 1982).

Reviewed and endorsed by a joint committee of the trustees and the board, it sought to dispel some of the rumours and doubts which were causing confusion in the membership at large, and information on some matters which had not been previously generally known. Dealing first with the purpose and development of the 3H program, and the relationship to The Rotary Foundation, it went on to explain the effect of Resolutions 80-114 and 80-120.

In dealing with the transfer to The Rotary Foundation of contributions to the 75th Anniversary Fund, it was explained the matter of tax exemptions assumed importance to certain corporations which could make donations of vaccines only to an entity which had the required tax exempt status – and already donated vaccines had been received with a retail value of approximately \$1,200,000.

To allay the fears of some confused by claims that the 75th Anniversary Fund was somehow inextricably mixed with other Foundation funds not contributed for 3H, the procedure for handling the new Foundation program called "Grants for the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program" was explained in these terms –

1. The 3H committee reviews 3H projects and recommends to the Board of Directors projects which it feels meet the criteria and the priorities, and suggests a budget.

2. If the Board concurs, it requests a grant from the monies in the 75th Anniversary Fund held by The Rotary Foundation,

3. If the Trustees concur that the project meets all qualifications, it makes a grant from the 75th Anniversary Fund, which is a separate, designated fund. Expenses of administering the Fund are paid from the Fund.

The seeds of doubt were also being sown about the future of the Scholarships program. The General Secretary's letter sought to allay those fears in these words:-

Some Rotarians have expressed concern about how Resolutions 80-114 and 80-120 might affect the funding or

expansion of existing Foundation programs. It is clear that the Trustees of the Foundation intend that the educational awards program will be maintained and continue to grow at its normal pace. For example, the Trustees announced last month the funding of 1,222 scholarships for academic year 1981-82, the largest number in history, and 15.5 percent higher than t h e previous year

For the past 30 years, the Foundation programs have emphasized the exchange of young men and women who go abroad to learn, and to promote friendly relations and goodwill through personal contacts. This will continue to be the major emphasis. The "Grants for the Health, Hunger and Humanity Program" and some of the projects being funded by Special Grants, are beginning to provide opportunities for people – Rotarians included – who can teach and share the skills and abilities gained in a lifetime of work. This is a new dimension to Rotary Foundation efforts, and is a concept being tested by some of the 3H projects being undertaken.

Undeterred by attempts by the Board and the Trustees to explain the ramifications of two decisions of the Council on Legislation establishing the 3H program as a continuing program of The Foundation and providing for its funding, and unwilling to accept the judgment of Rotary's "parliament", the small but vocal group of opponents pressed on with their campaign, with the intention of going back to the Council in 1983 to stop the program in its tracks.

On 11th September, 1981, Al Lilienfeld, President of the Rotary Club of Chicago, and Hal Higgins, its executive secretary, sent to the presidents and club executives of the large Rotary clubs (those in the U.S.A. with a membership exceeding 400) an invitation to a special meeting at the O'Hare Hilton Hotel on the 9th and 10th October, which read:

There are matters of fiscal responsibility in the operation of Rotary International about which we, at the Rotary Club of Chicago, have serious concerns, however, we are not the only ones who have these worried thoughts. Past Presidents of

Rotary International Roy Hickman, Jim Conway, Bill Robbins and Cliff Randall, and Past General Secretary of Rotary International George Means, are equally concerned. Another problem that needs facing is the future of the Rotary Foundation. All of the abovenamed have some doubts about the direction the Foundation may have planned for its objectives within the next few years.

It is because of these two serious matters that we invite the Presidents and Club Executives to attend a special meeting of the Large Clubs October 9 and 10 at the O'Hare Hilton Hotel here in Chicago. Joining us for this urgent conference will be Past Presidents Roy Hickman, Cliff Randall and Jim Conway.

Enclosed is some information put together by Jim Conway which will point out need for each of us to take a closer look at what is happening and take a leadership role toward whatever course of action may be necessary to insure a successful future for Rotary International and the Rotary Foundation.

Remarkably, no invitation was extended either to the President of R.I. or a representative of the Trustees of the Foundation to attend this meeting "to insure a successful future for Rotary International and the Rotary Foundation". In fact, when Stan McCaffrey (then the R.I. president) first heard of it on an official visit to one of the large Rotary clubs, he assumed his office had failed to inform him of it. On checking he discovered no advice had been sent to anyone at the R.I. Secretariat. Moreover, when he queried this with the Rotary Club of Chicago, he was informed this was not just an oversight; it was not intended that either he or a Foundation representative attend.

Twenty-six of the 46 clubs invited were represented, plus Past Presidents James F. Conway, Roy D. Hickman and Clifford A. Randall. An agenda was discussed around two papers entitled "Where is The Rotary Foundation Going?" and "Where is Rotary Going?" Jim Conway had prepared an eight page statement on the first subject. Its emphasis was plain from this statement in the second paragraph:

Are the traditional and successful programs to be continued and allowed to expand normally as they have in the past? Or is

there a trend developing to curtail the normal expansion of the educational awards program to the benefit of the 3H Programs?

No claim to authorship was made for the second paper - at least, not on the eleven page printed analysis of the financial operations of R.I. by the writer who made plain his prime concerns in the opening paragraph, in these words:

At the Institute of Past Presidents, Past Directors and Past District Governors at Boca Raton, Florida, during May 1981, the question was asked: 'Where is Rotary going?' and was answered by: 'It's going broke'.

But it dealt also with the wider and more fundamental issue of 'corporate activity' in these words:

A trend is developing where through board action, without prior mandate from the clubs or through presidential initiative new programs, corporate in nature, are being initiated . . . Because of the diversity of peoples and cultures and ideas existing in the Rotary clubs throughout the world, Rotary International should not have any institutional program, but should be a clearing house for ideas and an information center for the clubs and the District Governors, and a propagator of programs developed by different clubs for the benefit of other clubs worldwide.

Here was a concept for Rotary (a clearing house for ideas and an information centre) unacceptable to those who had a different view of its purpose and potential.

On 14 October, 1981 a brief report of the meeting was personally delivered by Al Lilienfeld, President of the Rotary Club of Chicago, to R.I. President Stan McCaffrey, who made clear his regret and disappointment that he or any other representative of Rotary International had not been invited to the meeting, particularly in view of the fact that the background material presented to the meeting contained inaccuracies and a one-sided viewpoint. Rotarian Lilienfeld also claimed he did not know the author of the document "Where is Rotary Going?", and said that he had made no attempt to check its accu-

racy of fact or interpretation before sending it out! I later spoke to representatives of some of the clubs who were in attendance, and who were not persuaded by the arguments put to the meeting; but obviously others were, for according to the report handed to President Stan, on the 3H question it was the consensus of those present (apparently no count was taken or recorded) that the funding of 3H projects should not be used to dilute other contributions to The Rotary Foundation, and that an appropriate resolution to this effect be prepared and submitted for adoption to the next meeting of the Council on Legislation.

Was it a tactical mistake, one must ask, to have this legislation, originating at a meeting of the Large Clubs of the U.S.A., presented and defended by them, when it was well known that many (and particularly the club which had convened the meeting) had at that time a long history of resistance to change, in their refusal to cede territory for the formation of new clubs? Fortunately, with more enlightened leadership, that has been since remedied.

George R. Means, retired General Secretary of R.I. was not at that meeting in person, but he continued to support its thrust. He was widely known and respected as an efficient administrator devoted to his work. In his more than 50 years of Rotary membership at that time he personally knew and worked with 66 of the 71 men who had served as President of R.I. When he spoke people listened. His was a forceful and credible voice raised against the 3H proposal. In a speech to the Rotary Club of Chicago on 6 April, 1982, widely reported and reprinted in a number of Rotary publications, he spoke on the subject "Perceptions of Rotary".

As he said, it was an encompassing subject, "inclusive of much more than can be examined in the time available here. Consequently I am going to touch upon only two broad aspects of Rotary. One is what I call the mechanics of Rotary, the other is the program of Rotary."

It was a long speech - too long to be quoted fully here. I will therefore omit that portion which dealt with the mechanics of Rotary, but repeat what he said under the heading of the program of Rotary in relation to the 3H program, having first dealt at some length with the "corporate activity" question:

At the convention in 1978 the president of R.I. announced that the board had established a "75th Anniversary Fund Program" to be used (in his words) "in underwriting international service programs of major significance worldwide". At that same convention the president-elect, for the following year, referring to the 75th Anniversary Fund Program, said "It will be known as the health, hunger and humanity program". He said that it would be funded by a special fund-raising beginning on 1 July, 1978 and ending on 30 June, 1980, and he emphasized for a "two-year period". It was also stated "the capital will be expended, principal and interest, over a period of not to exceed five years" with the trustees of the fund being the executive committee of the board of directors of Rotary International.

At the Council on Legislation here in Chicago in 1980, the board of directors proposed as an emergency and without prior notice, legislation to continue the Health, Hunger and Humanity program indefinitely; that it become a part of the regular program of promotion of The Rotary Foundation; that the 3H program be funded from funds of the Foundation. The proposal was adopted. Afterwards, a past officer of Rotary International wrote to me, referring to that action, and asked the question "What has happened to Rotary's integrity?" Also, many others increasingly have expressed concern for the direction in which our organisation is perceived by them to be going.

I have no question as to the soundness of Rotary's basic program and purpose nor with respect to its policies and procedures developed through years of tested experience. My concern is that in our exuberance and without benefit of perspectives of breadth and depth, there may have been an overreaching, and we may have been led to go too far too fast. Helgi Tomasson, a distinguished medical doctor from Reykjavik, Iceland, and at one time a director of Rotary International, told me it was his experience that extreme activity usually indicated either immaturity or malignancy. In all things, as Rotarians, we should endeavor to act with mature judgment.

In the early 1940's, as a result of its earnest consideration

of the subject, the board established a policy with respect to "Humanitarian Aid and Equipment". Under that heading in the Manual of Procedure during all of the years intervening and now the policy of Rotary International concerning humanitarian aid and equipment has stated that the board recognizes that governments can be relied upon "to take steps to alleviate suffering among distressed peoples, thereby making action by R.I. undesirable, since by multiplication of effort the aims of the respective governments may be retarded rather than assisted." It is stated also that because of this, "the board believes that R.I. should not ally itself with such movements."

In the face of such long standing and continuing policy, it is difficult to understand the abrupt and complete reversal of Rotary International's time-tested philosophy of action, and it is even more difficult to understand the blatant action which creates the 3H program as a strain on the funds of The Rotary Foundation without submitting such a course of action to the clubs for an expression of opinion.

No one, especially a Rotarian, can fault in principle efforts to alleviate human suffering. What Rotarians do should always be aimed at contributing to a realization of the solution and not to an aggravation of the problem.

The distinguished scientist and humanitarian Linus Pauling is the only person to receive two unshared Nobel prizes: in 1954, in chemistry, and in 1962, for peace. Recently Dr. Pauling spoke provocatively when he said "World problems are, of course, complicated; they do not have a simple, ethical solution . . . I, myself, believe," he said, " that in every nation throughout the world there should be only such a population as to permit every person to lead a good life, to have good food, for example." And he continued by saying "The goal of the human race should not be to have as many people on earth as can possibly be kept alive . . . but rather to have only that number of people who can lead good lives."

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities had reported that by the year 2000, nearly 80% of all people will live in less developed countries and in centers of concentrated poverty which will be increasingly hard pressed to support their populations.

It is not my purpose here to consider the merits of saving humanity for a life in which even those presently advantaged can look forward only to a worsening of living conditions and to a higher level of anxiety, as opposed to intensifying individual efforts toward education on the part of each of us with an end purpose of having, as Linus Pauling said, "the number of people who can lead good lives".

I would much prefer to have the cynics accuse Rotary of not doing anything because it does not attempt by corporate action to solve world encircling economic and social ills, than to see Rotary impair its effectiveness in areas in which it has achieved over a long period of years successful and wide-spread results through encouraging the individual to act.

At this point you are asking, with me, "What can I do as an individual Rotarian, living where I do, and limited to the contacts I have?" Listen to this: In 1978 the U.S. Chamber of Commerce made a survey of high school students on the subject of American business:

67% of the students saw no need for profits.

62% believed that government should provide jobs for all.

40% could not name one advantage of capitalism over communism

61% felt that a worker should not produce all that he can.

50% felt that government contributes most to national prosperity

55% thought that the best way to improve our standard of living is by giving workers better wages.

With evidence such as this, what more urgent call for action worldwide can one ask for? Unless those with whom we live and work and worship can be helped to understand the basics of what the world knows as the free enterprise system; unless each school boy and girl and each man and woman is helped to appreciate that "he profits most who serves best", there will be no viable tomorrow for which to save children's lives or to strengthen the undernourished and the impoverished. As Rotarians, we need to undergird our time-tested principles that the goal of first importance is in our clubs locally in the development of the individual Rotarian to act personally, where he is and among those with whom he lives and works and worships, and not to attempt to settle every problem confronting

this world, wherever such problems may be centered.

Ripon, Yorkshire, England, 27 miles north of Leeds, is a city of some 11,000 persons. It was chartered by Alfred the Great, in 886. At the city center is a picturesque market square from which a curfew horn has been sounded every evening since 886, without a single interruption or exception. A few years ago Martha and I were there visiting nearby Fountains Abbey and observed the curfew ceremony also. We arrived about 5 minutes before 9 in the evening. Three other couples, obviously tourists like ourselves, preceded us. The Watchman was there, dressed in his long double-breasted, braided and ornamented coat, and he wore a tricorne hat – all of which lent an aura of authenticity to the occasion.

Precisely at 9 o'clock, commencing at one corner of the market cross, the Watchman blew on his long South African buffalo horn a sustained blast in succession for each of the four corners. Each blast was for about 40 seconds announcing "all is well". Aside from being thrilled to experience at first hand tradition that had been occurring at the same spot every night for 1,087 years, I was impressed that each time the horn was blown a soft, low-pitched sound resulted – a sound that was not attention-getting and one that I suspected might easily go unnoticed.

One of the others present, who must have shared my reactions, voiced surprise that the sound of the horn was so low; that it probably could be heard for only a short distance.

With a sparkle in his eyes, the Watchman replied that contrary to the impression of persons standing nearby, such as we, the horn could be heard in all directions for at least 5 miles – that it was pitched at a low wave length frequency. Thus, the signal "All is Well" was carried throughout the country-side as a steady, calming assurance without being blustery or a disruptive fanfare.

As Rotarians, we must be very mindful of the power of rightly conceived individual actions. Even though our efforts and those of our fellow club members sometimes may be unspectacular, non-attention getting, and pitched at a low key, we need to be consciously and continually aware that the wave length of Rotary service is world-encircling and knows no lim-

itations because of political boundary, social position, race or any other presumed obstacle to wide-spread penetration.

Rotary is an organisation of some 875,000 men joined together in more than 18,800 clubs in 154 lands. I believe it is more widely extended than any organisation on earth outside the organised Church and the International Postal Union. If in Rotary the best men will be encouraged to do their best – as opposed to their average – the pitfalls, the things undone, the things unaccomplished can be dealt with effectively. The great voids in this world could be eliminated and filled with good if you and I individually do our best and all Rotarians everywhere do their best, in the places where each of us is. "He profits most who serves best."

When I read that speech I knew that George and I were poles apart in our vision for Rotary, and that more than ever we needed significant programs which would reach beyond our local communities to people in need, providing the mechanism to "encourage the individual to act" – and I felt confident most Rotarians would agree.

But there was no room for complacency. Jim Conway had decided to take his campaign to the Rotary world through the regional magazines, some of which (but not all) agreed to publish them. The R.I.B.I. June, 1982 publication Rotary contained a typical letter, which argued his case in these words:

Is 3H for Rotary? Is Rotary for 3H? These questions are interlocked. The first queries whether 3H can be a program of Rotary International; the second asks whether the Rotary Clubs of the world want it. Historically, 3H was conceived as a memorial, noble in purpose, to commemorate the 75th Anniversary of our organisation. Twelve million dollars (U.S.) was to be raised by voluntary subscriptions in a two-year period. The 75th Anniversary Fund and income from it were to be expended for the program envisaged, and the scheme was to terminate when the last of the money was expended.

No one questioned the idea, although it did not receive universal support because only about seven million of the twelve million sought was subscribed. Questions did arise, however, when – without advance notice to the Rotary world –

Resolution 80-120 was adopted by the Council on Legislation in Chicago in 1980, urging continuation of the program and utilising funds contributed for this purpose (3H) and such additional funds as may be appropriated from the General Fund of the Rotary Foundation, and by Resolution 80/114 "authorising \$4,500,000 of Foundation corpus to be used over the three-year period commencing 1st July, 1982."

These resolutions read together have been considered by those responsible as a mandate to continue the 3H programs, and to use money from the Foundation corpus to fund them once the 75th Anniversary Fund is exhausted.

The operation of the 3H programme is in the nature of a corporate activity by Rotary International, yet Rotary International has no constitutional authority to engage in corporate activities. Its only purposes are (a) to encourage, promote, extend and supervise Rotary throughout the world, and (b) to co-ordinate and generally direct activities of Rotary International (Article II). Since Rotary International is the association of Rotary Clubs throughout the world (Article 1), the association has no corporate powers.

Whether the Rotary Clubs of the world want 3H (irrespective of who may operate it) is a question the Clubs have never been asked. In the light of Resolution 23/24 and the functioning of Rotary International these many years as an organ for the association of the Clubs, rather than an independent entity without powers to operate on its own, I suggest the question should be submitted to Convention. If it is submitted, Rotarians and their clubs – before voting to continue 3H – would want to know whether it will be operated (for instance) like the Special Grants program of the Foundation, or otherwise. Under the Special Grants program, Foundation funds are advanced to help finance a project originated by a Club or District. The matching is usually on a 50/50 basis. In other words, the Foundation helps those who help themselves.

I submit that the clubs in Convention assembled should decide the future direction of Rotary's endeavours, whether it be through club and district efforts, matching funds supplied by the Foundation to clubs or districts – or by way of this new concept, direct from the Board Room and Office of the

Secretariat.

It was a cleverly constructed letter, written with all the skill of a lawyer arguing a case for his client. In inferring that because little more than half the fund raising target had been met, he ignored the fact that despite solid promotion of The Foundation following the death of Paul Harris, it was 17 years before contributions reached \$1 million per year. In our first year we had raised \$1.5 million, and in the second year a further \$6 million.

In asserting "the Foundation helps those who help themselves" he had obviously overlooked the fact that the bulk of its expenditures was on the Scholarships program, where there was no financial contribution from its beneficiaries, or sponsoring clubs or districts.

I was surprised to read of his advocacy for these matters to be decided at a Convention, in the light of the failure of this tactic earlier at the Dallas Convention. The Council on Legislation is where matters such as these are customarily dealt with. But I admired his tactical skill in the final sentence of his letter, in representing this as a program being thrust upon the clubs "from the Board Room and Office of the Secretariat".

As one would expect, the letter brought mixed responses.

Following publication of a similar letter in the Regional Magazine in South Africa, the president of a Rotary club there wrote (in part):

Although my club approves of the principles of the 3H programme, it is our opinion that Resolution 80/120 is a complete breach of faith, not only to those who donated in the past to the Rotary Foundation for its specific purposes, but also to those who gave to the 3H program on the understanding it was a "once-off" effort to mark the 75th Anniversary of Rotary. Will both funds be raided again for some other project to mark the 100th Anniversary? . . . Perhaps part of the problem is explained in the article by George R. Means (Past General Secretary of R.I.) entitled "Perceptions of Rotary" which appeared in the January 1982 issue of Rotary in Africa.

On behalf of my club I urge all Rotarians to study the two articles to which I have referred, and it is hoped that other

clubs and District Conferences will join the Rotary Club of . . . in an effort to ensure that Resolution 80/120 is rescinded at the next Council on Legislation.

On 25th June, 1982 Rotarian Stanley J. Stevens of the Rotary Club of Newport, Isle of Wight, wrote to the Editor of Rotary (the official magazine of R.I.B.I.) stating (in part):

It is now over thirty years since I joined the Rotary Club of Newport, Isle of Wight, and the clubs I have visited worldwide must now number ninety. Yet, until 24th January, 1979, when appropriately I had as my guest at club luncheon an Indian who works amongst the hungry of his people, did I ever feel so drawn to a Rotary project as the 3H's, which I learned about that day, and which expressed everything I had wanted Rotary to say.

Unlike Past President (1969-70) of Rotary International, James F. Conway of Sun City, U.S.A., I feel that the future of Health, Hunger and Humanity lies in inspiration and perspiration rather than legislation. Its future resides more in the hearts, minds and hands of individual Rotarians acting together than in additional club cash levies.

These two letters are probably representative of the attitudes of those thousands who already knew where they stood on what was the most controversial question confronting the Rotary world at that time. But there was a third group - those who had yet to decide.

Now the stage was set for the final battle, on the floor of the Council on Legislation at Monaco in 1983, with two proposals, one denying R.I. the right to engage in corporate activities, operating merely as an administrative unit, the other seeking to repeal the decision of the 1980 Council which endorsed the 3H program and provided for its funding.

In response, in September, 1982 the board and the trustees decided, through their research department, to conduct a survey on how Rotarians thought Foundation funds should be spent. 330 Rotarians responded - 26 from ANZAO, 44 from Asia, 82 from CENAEM, 32 from GB&I, 17 from SACAMA and 129 from USCB. Statistically it was an adequate and

representative response to a survey which provided comprehensive background material on each of the foundation programs, and the level of funding over several years. The question asked was "Given these data, please fill in the percentage allocation you feel would be best, based on your opinion of the effectiveness of the programs and how you would like your contribution to be spent, for each of the programs and each of the years shown in the table below". The results were interesting, demonstrating strong, but gradually decreasing support for the traditional programs, and consistent support for 3H at a level above that contemplated and budgeted by the trustees.

Year	Educational	Group Study Exchange	Special Scholarships	3 H Grant
1983-84	73.1 %	9.9 %	3.4 %	13.7
1984-85	72.3 %	10.0 %	3.5 %	14.2
1985-86	71.5 %	10.0 %	3.7 %	14.7
1986-87	71.0 %	10.1 %	3.8 %	15.0
1987-88	70.5 %	10.2 %	3.8 %	15.5

The board and the trustees assessed the program at their meetings in October and November, 1982, and in background material given to the 1983 Council on Legislation, observed that in four years the 3H program had:

- provided a service focus for the 75th anniversary celebration of R.I.;
- attracted in a two-year period more than US\$7,200,000 in initial support from Rotarians;
- developed some 30 projects in more than 20 countries;
- achieved highly positive public relations which magnified Rotary's image throughout the world as a service organisation;
- increased Rotarians' awareness of international service

potential;

- attracted more than 800 Rotarians, 237 of whom (from 29 countries) have shared, or are scheduled to share, skills as international volunteers;

- channeled more than 22 million doses of vaccines to immunisation programs, primarily for children, in 16 developing countries; 3.6 million doses have been donated by pharmaceutical firms and Rotarians.

As a result of this analysis, both the board of directors and the trustees unanimously adopted the following decisions:

a. The 3H program shall continue to be developed, with funding from the corpus of The Rotary Foundation, after the 75th Anniversary Fund has been fully appropriated, for a period of at least six years beginning 1 July, 1982;

b. The 3H program shall become an activity of The Rotary Foundation, effective 1 July, 1983, fully administered by the Trustees of the Foundation, with administrative expenses paid from the 75th Anniversary Fund and future earned income of that fund in 1983-84 and 1984-85, with subsequent administrative expenses to be provided from the earned income fund of The Rotary Foundation; and

c. 3H project appropriations from corpus for the triennium beginning 1 July, 1985 shall be limited to 12.5 percent of total appropriations.

A line had now been drawn in the sand — the board and the trustees on one side, their position made clear in this decision, and strengthened in their resolve by the results of their survey and the feedback from the membership at large; the opposing forces on the other side, led by Jim Conway, as they prepared for the inevitable showdown at the forthcoming 1983 Council on Legislation.

I had agreed to accept primary responsibility for organising opposition to proposed Resolution 83-181. Past R.I. Director Mike Pedrick had accepted a similar responsibility in respect of Proposed Enactment 83-44. Accordingly, on 28 January, 1983 I sent the following letter to a number of voting delegates to the Council:

Since the inception of the 3H Program, there have been a few who have gone to great lengths to make known their opposition

to it. One in particular has used direct correspondence, the pages of regional magazines, and a meeting of representatives of some of the larger clubs in the U.S.A. (to which neither the President of R.I., the General Secretary, nor a representative of The Rotary Foundation were invited) to try to halt a program which, in less than five years, has achieved remarkable results. In consequence, as you know, there are a number of proposals coming before the Council on Legislation at Monaco which threaten either to halt the program, or to restrict the authority of the Trustees in their administration of the programs of The Rotary Foundation.

Proposed resolution 83-181 and proposed enactment 83-44 constitute the greatest threat to the program.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION 83-181 seeks to repeal 80-120 adopted by the 1980 Council, which by majority decision, expressed its support for the program and its funding from the general funds of The Rotary Foundation (after the 75th Anniversary Fund has been completely appropriated).

This proposal came to the 1980 Council in consequence of the evidence available to the President and the Board of widely expressed support from Rotarians around the world, and in order to test assertions being made to the contrary by a few people vocal in their opposition.

Now we are being asked to review that decision — fortunately, at a time when the Rotary world has had further opportunity to assess the program, and before any of the general funds of The Rotary Foundation have been expended on it.

I welcome that opportunity. This is the time for those who support the 3H program to answer, once and for all, the criticism which has unfortunately confused some and caused disillusionment and doubt in the minds of a few.

If you share that view, I would ask you to make it known at every opportunity, before and during the Council, realising that the stronger the vote in favour of continuing the program, and against Proposed Resolution 83-181, the more positively and effectively the program can be developed.

PROPOSED ENACTMENT 83-44 would have the effect, if adopted, of closing down not only the 3H program, but also it seems to me, many other programs and activities of Rotary International — World Community Service, The Youth Exchange

Program, and The Rotary Foundation, to name just a few. To adopt this proposal would be to turn the Rotary clock back 60 years, fragmenting our organisation into nearly 20,000 separate units. There would be no opportunity for collective or co-operative effort in major programs. The words "corporate action" have for too long been used to build walls instead of bridges.

What is corporate action? I can find no definition of it in our documents. If it means action taken by the Board of R.I. in respect of programs which are mandatory on all clubs, I am opposed to it.

However, I believe the adoption of proposed enactment 83-44 would prohibit or restrict the Board in its responsibility (in terms of Article II of the Constitution of R.I.) "to co-ordinate and generally direct the activities of R.I." through collective and co-operative programs and activities available to Rotary Clubs at their option.

The adoption of 83-44 would have serious and far-reaching consequences upon the programs and vitality of an organisation which has shaken off its image of a cosy club of affluent business men "going to lunch". Certainly, it would sound the death knell for programs such as the 3H program. I urge you to oppose it as vigorously as you can.

Enclosed is a sheet which sets out some facts and points of view on proposals relevant to the 3H program. You may find these useful in your consideration of the questions raised and to be raised, and in your discussion with others.

I look forward to seeing you at Monaco. It will be an interesting, challenging and extremely important Council."

Attached were the following two pages, to provide further ammunition to be used at Monaco:-

Much has been written in opposition to the 3H program, principally by two people, as is their right. Over a long period of time I have refrained from being drawn into debate. However, with the program under threat at Monaco, I believe now is the time to speak out.

I have selected a number of statements which set out what appear to be the principal arguments expressed against the

program, and have then commented on them, in the hope that this may be useful to you in your consideration of various proposals at Monaco.

These opinions are being shared with a limited number of delegates to the Council – but I would hope that you will in turn use them as the basis for discussion with others attending –

1. STATEMENT – Rotary's genius is recognised as finding expression through individual convictions and activities of its members and not in a collective capacity.

Comment – Isn't The Rotary Foundation an example of what can be achieved when Rotarians join in 'collective capacity'? How many individual clubs could fund and organise and administer a scholarship program such as is made possible through T.R.F.? Where would Interact, Rotaract and the International Youth Exchange program be without collective action?

2. STATEMENT – "It is not within the scope of Rotary International for Rotary International as such, corporately, to sponsor a particular project or program or to prescribe a uniform project or program for sponsorship by all Rotary clubs at the local club level."

Comment – I am not aware that R.I. has prescribed any uniform project or program for sponsorship by all Rotary clubs. Certainly the 3H program has never been mandatory for all clubs – nor were contributions to the 75th Anniversary Fund. They were voluntary.

3. STATEMENT – "Charitable grants by The Foundation would be a brand new concept of programming"

Comment – The Rotary Foundation's first grant (in 1930) was to the International Society for Crippled Children. Fifty years later, the 3H program declared polio immunisation a major worldwide emphasis.

After World War II, the Foundation undertook a program of relief, in the form of food and clothing, to refugees and people in war-torn countries. More than 30 years later, Rotarians are serving as 3H volunteers to provide medical, dental and other care for people in emergency, refugee and disaster areas.

4. STATEMENT – "Whether the Rotary Clubs of the world want 3H (irrespective of who may operate it) is a question the

clubs have never been asked."

Comment - They supported the concept to the extent of \$7.2 million in two years. It was endorsed again at the Council on Legislation at Chicago in 1980. Since then two surveys have been conducted, the results of which confirm widespread Rotary support. The latest survey indicates an allocation of 13.7% of contributions to be spent on 3H projects during 1983-84, rising to 15.5% in 1987-88. The Board and Trustees have decided to expend on the program during the triennium 1 July, 1985 no more than 12.5% of total appropriations.

5. STATEMENT - "Rotary should not handle any other activity that is already being handled by some other agency."

Comment - If that argument is valid, then we should never have started our educational scholarships program, and we should now abandon it. The Foundation was not the pioneer in this field and it still has no monopoly on educational scholarships. In fact, our program, although one of the most significant individually, in total represents only a small fraction of a 1 1 1 programs serving the same market.

6. STATEMENT - Quoting Dr. Linus Pauling, the author writes "The goal of the human race should not be to have as many people on earth as can possibly be kept alive . . . but rather to have only that number of people who can lead good lives." The author then goes on to say "I would much prefer to have the cynics accuse Rotary of not doing anything because it does not attempt by corporate action to solve world-encircling economic and social ills, than to see Rotary impair its effectiveness in areas in which it has achieved over a long period of years successful and wide-spread results through encouraging the individual to act."

Comment - Linus Pauling states a goal - a good life for all. That's the goal of the 3H program - but not by the law of the jungle - the survival of the fittest - the abandonment of the living.

7. STATEMENT - "What can I do as an individual Rotarian, living where I do, and limited to the contacts I have?" After quoting the results of a survey of high school students by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the author went on to say "With

evidence such as this, what more urgent call for action world-wide can one ask for? Unless those with whom we live and work and worship can be helped to understand the basics of what the world knows as the free enterprise system . . . there will be no viable to-morrow for which to save children's lives or to strengthen the undernourished and impoverished."

Comment - We cannot afford to wait upon some grand strategy for the future. The problems are all around us, and unless we try to solve them there may be no viable tomorrow.

I would say to one who believes that the most urgent call for action world-wide is to help people to understand the basics of the free enterprise system "If you've never had to worry where the next meal will come from; if you've never known a father's anguish, haunted by the spectre of polio, when a son develops a persistent limp; if your survival in old age depends not on survival of your children to take care of you, but on a guaranteed retirement income funded by a generous employer; if your dog or cat eats better and enjoys better medical care than millions of the poor of this world - then you have no right to turn your back on them. Certainly Rotary must not.

Rotary will stand condemned before the world if, at this stage in its development, it abandons a program which demonstrates its concern for people, and provides to individual Rotarians an opportunity to give real life and meaning and purpose to the Object of Rotary.

Proposed Enactment 83-44 sought to enshrine in the Constitution of R.I. a provision that Rotary International had no right or authority to engage in any activities as a corporate entity, alone or in concert with others. It would be limited to servicing the clubs, districts, their officers and the board of directors - nothing more than an administrative unit. It read:

It is enacted by Rotary International that the Constitution of Rotary International, Article III be and hereby is amended by adding at the end the following: The member Rotary Clubs shall have the exclusive right to implement the Object of Rotary as set forth in this Article. Nothing contained in this Constitution, the By-Laws of Rotary International or the Standard Rotary Club Constitution shall be interpreted or considered as a dele-

gation of such right of implementation to the association of Rotary clubs herein designated Rotary International.

It was an audacious thrust aimed at the jugular vein of the 3H program; which, if passed, would have destroyed not only the 3H program, but also so many other great programs and activities.

Although the board's position was well known, there was a natural reluctance for them, as a body, to engage in debate on the two proposals at the Council. This was a time for the voting delegates (representatives of the clubs in their districts) to argue the case for and against each proposition. Mike Pedrick (past director and past trustee) relished the opportunity to lead the debate opposing Proposed Enactment 83-44. He was a big man, a powerfully persuasive speaker, passionate in his attack on the proposal put forward by Jim Conway on behalf of the three clubs which had proposed it. Here is an extract of his speech to the Council:

What will happen if 83-44 passes? Let me tell you. First, there will be no more Rotary Foundation. Oh, I'm sure that the proponents of the measure will tell you that the Foundation is a separate legal entity and is not part of Rotary. Really? Why then do we have an Article Ten in our Constitution? Why are the Trustees of the Foundation appointed by the President of Rotary International? Why is it necessary for this very Council to approve the expenditures from the corpus of the Foundation? Why is it necessary for the Board of Directors to approve the annual budget of the Foundation? Why is it that no new program may be started by the Foundation without the approval of the Board of Directors? Why is it that the only agents of the Foundation at the district level are officers of Rotary International? The answer is obvious.

But not only will the Foundation be ended by the approval of 83-44, so will such significant programs as the International Institutes, the Zone Institutes, the Regional Conferences, the World community Service program, RYLA, Interact, Rotaract, the President's Goodwill Conferences. And what about the International Assembly? Is it for the purpose of implementing the Object of Rotary? If so it can only be the project of an indi-

vidual club. Would the International Convention qualify as "implementing the Object of Rotary?" If so, it too must end.

In fact, every project of every district in the Rotary world would have to be discontinued. That great scholarship program of the Japanese districts would end. The French districts would no longer be allowed to support the Hôpital Sans Frontier. The Central States exchange program in America would be a thing of the past.

In the beginning I said that we had a remarkable opportunity. We have an opportunity that no other Council has ever had and for this I guess we should be grateful to the proponents of 83-44. They have given us a chance to tell the entire Rotary world

no, all of the world - that we are not going to shirk our responsibilities; that Rotary is, and will remain, a potent force for good in this very troubled world and that we will not only preach Service as a motto, but will practise it as well. We have a

opportunity today to make a positive statement for peace and understanding. We can do this by not merely rejecting proposal 83-44 but by defeating it so decisively, so overwhelmingly, that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind that Rotary International refuses to retreat to a bygone era that is gone forever and can never be recaptured.

Mike was not the only one to speak. Others crowded the microphones, with the few speaking in favour of the proposal being greatly outnumbered by those opposed to it. Finally it was defeated, as Mike had hoped, decisively and overwhelmingly. I don't have the figures, but it was a crushing defeat for those forces which had fought so long and so tenaciously, not just to kill off the 3H program, but to ensure that never again (unless by action of some future Council on Legislation) would Rotary clubs be able to combine to engage in activities or programs beyond their local boundaries.

On arrival at Monaco ahead of the meeting of the Council I was able to meet with many of the voting delegates, and we agreed that in the debate on Proposed Resolution 83/181 each would speak to rebut just one of the arguments put forward by our opponents. Our plan was to have short, sharp speeches, but

plenty of them – each dealing with a different point, some I had supplied, some others which would occur to them. I would respond at the end, to conclude our case.

I had prepared a speech, but it was not necessary. In fact, I became embarrassed as one by one those opposing the resolution took their place at the microphones, with scarcely a voice raised in support. I feared we ran the risk of alienating the support of those who would feel sympathy for the under dog. I need not have worried. As with the previous proposal, this one was defeated overwhelmingly.

And so at the Council on Legislation at Monaco in 1983 five years of conflict came to an end. At last we could get on with the program, at the same time having laid to rest the "corporate activity" bogey to which we had for so long been captive.

But no account of that struggle would be complete without reference to support which came from many quarters. Ken Scheller (past R.I. Vice-president) spoke for many in his open letter to Jim Conway, published in Rotary Down Under. Here is an abridged version of what he wrote, with typical Ken Scheller directness:

Dear Jim – In the February issue of Rotary Down Under you pose the question "Rotary, what is its future direction?" I submit that, provided Rotary adopts the attitude you espouse in your article, the answer will be "backwards"!

You quote the basic policy expressed by the R.I. Board in 1962-63 and again in 1975. Neither of those statements concluded with "forever and forever, amen". One of Rotary's great strengths is that it has remained relevant to its time by changing, from time to time, its attitudes, policies and practices. You worry about the Board of R.I. recognising and acting according to new trends. Rotary should not only expect but demand that the Board of R.I. constantly considers and, with the resources available to it, researches new ideas.

No matter what doom and concern can be read into so many of the items of proposed legislation for Monaco, it is an indisputable fact that Rotary in 1983 is more imaginative, more creative, larger in membership and more exciting from every viewpoint than ever before.

Don't let us go back to the days when, in community service, clubs were encouraged to select a project which could be completed in one year, with the result that, in the main, the real community needs were set aside, when corporate action between clubs wanting to do something big and better was more likely to be frowned upon by Rotary's leadership, when the term "international service" was understood to mean the first hit in a Davis Cup match and little else.

What about asking the clubs that proposed 83-44 – Cleveland (chartered 1910) Louisville (1911) and Madison (1913) to withdraw it to allow the council more time to discuss issues that the majority of Rotarians of the world are really concerned about and are appropriate to Rotary's dynamism? Such as, for instance, how can we make the 3H program even more effective?"

At that critical time in our history, when many were confused by conflicting arguments and viewpoints, the Ken Schellers of the Rotary world, prepared to speak out, were vital to the survival of the program.

Unfortunately there was a period when the early enthusiasm for the program waned. I believe it was due in part (but not entirely) to the fact that the Trustees had imposed an upper limit of \$300,000 on any one project – less than half the funding of our first project, and of several others. In fact, when Dick Walker sought to replicate in Zimbabwe the very successful literacy project in Thailand (which cost in excess of \$600,000) he was confronted with this \$300,000 limit which made replication impossible; so he introduced a modified project which, though effective, could have achieved much more. I believe this decision sent the wrong message to the Rotary world. It implied a diminution in support for the program. It was also a departure from the original concept of funding major humanitarian projects. The result was a diminishing demand, and for smaller projects, to the point that the budget for 1994-95 was only \$1 million – and that proved adequate to fund the limited number of applications for acceptable projects. There were other factors, which the Trustees

decided to examine.

In a bid to reverse the direction in which the program was headed, the Chairman of The Rotary Foundation Trustees in October, 1994, appointed a special committee "to more thoroughly review the 3H program". Trustee Glen Estess was the chairman of that committee. Other members were Cliff Dochterman, Frank Nakajima, Bill Sergeant and O.P. Vaish. Their final report was presented to the April, 1995, Trustees meeting, the minutes of which placed on record their commitment to the program, and acknowledged that after sixteen years of humanitarian service the program had :

- a. enriched the lives of millions of children and adults worldwide;
- b. demonstrated its capacity to harness substantial human and financial resources to undertake major projects, thus earning the respect of world agencies and national governments;
- c. secured access to substantial government grants which would not otherwise have been available;
- d. established Rotary's credentials as an organisation concerned for people and their needs regardless of race, colour, creed or political persuasion; and, in consequence, has facilitated its acceptance in areas formerly closed to Rotary;
- e. created a significant new dimension of The Rotary Foundation to complement its educational and cultural exchange programs and activities;
- f. provided Rotarians, Rotary clubs and districts with a positive and effective avenue for conducting international service projects beyond the capacity of any one club or district;
- g. generated in Rotarians worldwide a new sense of pride in the achievements of The Rotary Foundation, reflected in increased financial support for all its programs.

Since that report the upper limit on any one project has been set at \$500,000 (more, under special circumstances), and in consequence clubs and districts have grasped the opportunity to be involved in major projects. In fact, in 1998-99 \$10.5 million was committed to 28 new projects – an average of \$375,000 per project. To 30 June, 1999, 216 projects in 70 countries have been funded at a cost of almost \$58 million. That's an average, despite the lean years in the early 1990's, of \$268,000 per project – certainly sufficient to make a real

impact in helping meet the needs of a needy world.

I realise I have devoted much of this story of the birth and development of the 3H program to the early struggle to survive. I have done that, not only because those events are an integral part of its history, but also, importantly, because they chronicle the struggle to change established policies and philosophies which, largely by virtue of their age, were accepted and adopted almost without question. Today, looking back on those turbulent times, I try to analyse and understand the reasons a handful of influential men – good men – were so determined in their opposition to what most of us believed to be an opportunity to extend the reach and effectiveness of the organisation to which they had devoted so much.

Was it because they lacked compassion for the sick and hungry and disadvantaged of the third world? Generally speaking, I don't think so.

Was it because they thought the little we could do would make no real difference in a world where the needs were so great – that the task was beyond us, the responsibility of others (governments, United Nations agencies) with greater resources? I don't think so. These were men who knew, more than most, the potential power of our organisation.

Was it because they feared the impact upon The Rotary Foundation and its traditional programs? Yes, I know they did, for two of them met with me in Evanston early in my term of office and warned me that this new program would (to use their expression) "prick the bubble" of the Foundation's proud and successful record. They were reluctant to take that risk.

But primarily, I believe, it was because they perceived in the establishment of the 3H program a radical departure from the familiar practices and policies of the past with which they had grown up and with which they felt so comfortable. It's a very human failing, to which we are all prone to some extent. That this small group of highly principled men should have clung to it for so long, in the face of mounting evidence of the desire for change, surprised me.

The grand old home in which they had lived for so many years, with all its memories and familiar features, was about to be remodelled, with a new wing added, a more modern design, new windows installed to let in more light and improve the view

IV

A comprehensive report of the growth and development of the 3H program since those early days would take several volumes – certainly more than I am capable of writing. But reports on a few of its programs will demonstrate their scope and effectiveness, as justification for the trauma of its birth.

But first, a brief account of the birth of PolioPlus as an extension of the polio immunisation projects carried out by 3H, for it is much more than just a project – it is a major program.

PolioPlus

This does not pretend to be the PolioPlus story. Others will write it, for such is its scope and importance it merits a massive amount of time and research. What I am attempting here is a brief account of the transition from an element of the 3H program, involving increasing numbers of individual polio immunisation projects, to a major global program – the largest non-governmental health program in history.

3H has been described as the child that grew into PolioPlus. Looking back, PolioPlus can be seen as a natural extension of the first Rotary-funded 3H project to immunise more than six million children in the Philippines against polio, although I doubt that anyone in those early days shared that vision. In launching the Philippines project in September, 1979, President Jim Bomar lifted the veil on the future when he made this prophetic statement: "Now we begin the first project of Rotary's program of the future – the Health, Hunger and Humanity program." Could he, or Dr. Benny Santos who had introduced the \$760,000 project, have dreamed that it would spawn another to which Rotary would eventually commit almost \$400 million? I think not.

Earlier (some time in April, 1979) I had been in Seattle, where two frigates under construction for the Australian navy were moored. I was told they cost about \$100 million each. This caused me to wonder what we could do in Rotary with that sort

of money. Later, flying back to Evanston, I read that for about the same money the World Health Organisation had eradicated smallpox, so I telephoned Dr. John Sever, one of my governors, and asked him whether he thought there was any disease Rotary could tackle, with some prospect of similar success. I couldn't have asked anyone better qualified. After having received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Chicago, he entered its Graduate School and then the Medical School of Northwestern University, where he received the M.S., M.D., and Ph.D (Microbiology). At the time I 'phoned him he was the chief of the Infectious Diseases Branch of the US National Institutes of Health outside Washington D.C. and had devoted his professional life to vaccine research .

On 16 May, 1979, he responded to my enquiry, in which he stated: "If a single vaccine were to be selected for the 3H program, I would recommend poliomyelitis." It was that recommendation, and the board's subsequent endorsement of it, which marked the beginning of PolioPlus, although at that stage polio immunisation became merely a priority of one of the three Hs.

Many people have contributed to the success of PolioPlus; in my opinion none more, apart from Carlos Canseco, than John Sever – highly qualified professionally, with above average organisational skills, contacts in the right places in Washington and the World Health Organisation, a friend of Dr. Sabin and a personal commitment to the program which has kept him involved at every stage of its development, from the beginning right through to the present. He worked on the initial shipment of vaccine to the Philippines, and then in Malawi to assist the Lillongwe Rotary Club prepare a 3H proposal (one of the very earliest) to set up a hospital for treatment of children with polio. He has been involved at every stage since, at present in the Advocacy Team under the chairmanship of Herb Pigman, securing substantial grants from national governments to enable us to finish the task to which we are committed.

Within six months of his recommendation the board at its November, 1979 meeting agreed that the eradication of poliomyelitis and the alleviation of its consequences throughout the world be a primary goal in the 3H program, and at its May,

1980 meeting the 3H committee recommended a target date, 2005 – Rotary's 100th anniversary. Also, at the 1980 Council on Legislation it was resolved "to commend the purpose, aims and development of the Health Hunger and Humanity Program and the announced goal of working with other agencies local and worldwide to help eliminate polio through immunisation."

The following year, when Stanley E. McCaffrey became President of R.I. on 1 July, 1981, he created a "New Horizons Committee" under the chairmanship of Cliff Dochterman. Rotarians were urged to submit to the committee ideas and suggestions for Rotary's future. Among the 2,900 letters which poured in was one from John Sever, recommending implementation of the recommendation of the 3H committee in May, 1980 to immunise all the world's children against polio by the year 2005.

Thus, contrary to what has been frequently claimed, by the time of the report of the New Horizons Committee in 1982, the 3H committee had been working on polio immunisation and eradication for several years, and their recommendations had already been endorsed by the 1980 Council.

According to Sarah Gibbard Cook in her history of the PolioPlus program (For All the World's Children): . . . the committee, when it met in January, spent little time on Sever's proposal. The 3H program could continue to channel funds into polio immunisation. Polio immunisation grants were already approved for Haiti and Bolivia in addition to the Philippines, and proposals were in the works for Morocco, Sierra Leone and the Gambia. A quick too-casual cost estimate suggested an overall polio vaccine cost of \$20 to \$25 million, or about a million dollars a year.

This, of course, could be funded within the 3H program budget. It was no big deal. In fact, when Cliff Dochterman addressed the 1982 R.I. convention about the work of the New Horizons Committee, polio immunisation was not among the proposals he deemed important enough to mention. After all, it was what was already being done. A goal had been declared, proposals for polio immunisation were being received and funded. There was no sense of urgency. We had 23 years to accomplish the task.

But that all changed when Dr. Carlos Canseco attended the December, 1982 meeting of the 3H committee. Holding professorships of medicine at the University of Nuevo Leon and the University of Monterrey, he had worked with Dr. Albert Sabin in Mexico on national polio immunisation days and the testing of an improved measles vaccine. Additionally, he had been nominated to serve as President of Rotary International in 1984-85. He spoke, therefore, with a good deal of authority, both professionally and by virtue of his standing in the organisation.

He strongly opposed the plan to send vaccines to country after country, for routine ongoing immunisation. "Attacking polio piecemeal" he said, "was like sweeping the ocean back with a broom." He urged adoption of the plan we now know so well as national polio immunisation days – but it didn't happen automatically. Initially rejecting the mass immunisation model, the World Health Organisation was finally persuaded to approve the method. The background to that campaign is well documented in Sarah Gibbard Cook's history For All the World's Children.

The man who led the campaign, and who finally succeeded in translating an idea into a plan of action, was Carlos Canseco. Immediately he assumed office as president on 1 July, 1985, he appointed a Polio 2005 committee, with John Sever as its chairman. They were charged with the responsibility of bringing to the board a recommended long-term plan of action to immunise all the children of the world against polio by the year 2005. Dr. Albert Sabin was invited to join the committee. Those three men – Canseco, Sever and Sabin – with strong support and leadership from Past General Secretary Herb Pigman, were in my view the persons primarily responsible for the development of the plan.

James Grant, executive director of UNICEF, was a keynote speaker at the 1994 International Convention at Birmingham, where he laid out his vision of how Rotarians could take leadership in child survival. Herb Pigman and others consulted with him in New York after the Polio 2005 Committee meeting in July; and arising from these discussions it was established that the total costs of vaccines would be, not the \$20-\$25 million estimated earlier by the New Horizons Committee, but

\$120 million. This was an ambitious but not impossible target, spread over 20 years at an average of \$6 million per year.

Any idea of proceeding sedately along in relatively leisurely fashion for 20 years under the 3H program was discarded at the 1985 convention at Kansas City, where Dr. Sabin received the prestigious Rotary Award for World Understanding. In his acceptance speech he urged adoption of his recommended strategy of mass immunisations of whole countries on a specified day, warning that failure to accelerate the program in this way would result in unnecessary pain and suffering. He put the figure at eight million additional people in developing countries with paralysis that could have been prevented.

It was a compelling argument, presented with all the fervour and passion of a man completely dedicated to a mission he wanted to see accomplished while there was yet time. "I was impatient as a young man," he said, "and I am still more impatient as a 78 year old man because I don't have much time left."

That speech, I believe, was the launching pad for the PolioPlus campaign. Against the background of potential massive and unnecessary human suffering, no longer could we continue to fund polio immunisation as one of a number of 3H projects – for there were others, in increasing number. In fact, 65% of the 43 major projects in the first five years of the 3H program were for projects other than immunisation. About 37 million were immunised under 3H projects before PolioPlus took over.

A separate fund was established, professional fund-raisers engaged, and a target of \$120 million set, broken down by zone, district and club. I think most of us thought the target rather ambitious. But we underestimated the willingness of the Rotarians of the world to support one large, worthwhile project – which they did with total contributions of \$247 million.

The rest is history, still in the making. As at 30 June, 1998, Rotary had committed US\$313 million for global polio eradication, benefiting more than one billion children in 119 nations around the world.

By the year 2005 that commitment will exceed US\$425 million; and because immunisation will be no longer necessary, the world will save at least US\$1.5 billion each year. In

financial terms, therefore, our investment in the PolioPlus program will yield substantial dividends.

But the protection of the world's children against polio is infinitely more significant; for it has been officially estimated that, thanks to the immunisation efforts of the last decade, more than 500,000 cases of polio are prevented each year, and as many as four million children who might have been polio victims are walking and playing normally. The day is rapidly approaching when poliomyelitis will no longer maim and kill innocent young lives, as it has done for centuries.

I hope to be at the 2005 Rotary International Convention, when the president makes that announcement –

- To acknowledge the unwavering support of men like Mike Pedrick, Ken Scheller, Bill Sergeant, Jim Bomar, members of the 1978-79 board, the Reach Out district governors who bore the brunt of the initial opposition, 3H Committee members and others who stood firm against the barrage of criticism levelled against them, without ever seeking or expecting kudos for their invaluable contribution;

- To pay tribute to the pioneering work of Dr. Albert Sabin;
- And especially to salute Carlos Canseco, John Sever, Herb Pigman and others like them who, while serving on 3H committees, were inspired to seek goals beyond their present horizon.

Fish Farming Project – Bangladesh

I was working in my office in Nambour one day when I had a telephone call from a man I had never met. He introduced himself as Ray de Zylva, a member of the Rotary Club of Gisborne (New Zealand). He told me he had worked for several years with the United Nations (I think it was their Food and Agricultural Organisation Agency) in their fisheries division. He had heard of the 3H program, and thought there was an opportunity in Bangladesh to do something worthwhile in establishing inland fish farms, so I invited him to call to discuss the idea. I remember asking him could Rotary, with its relatively limited funds, do the job better than the FAO Agency.

He explained that, although that agency trained people in the technique of inland fish farming, they did not take it the next

stage of providing the trainees with funding to enable them to buy fingerlings, supplies and funds to become established. It was that extra dimension which made the Rotary project attractive.

The result of that conversation was that in 1983 The Rotary Foundation made a 3H grant of \$US486,000 to the Rotary Club of Comilla (Bangladesh) for a five-year program, with Ray de Zylva the volunteer co-ordinator on behalf of The Foundation. Eighteen trainees were selected for the first course, one from each upazilla (group of 10 villages). Each of them undertook to train up to 10 people living around his home, whose services he needed for the development of his farm. They, in turn, would be able to extend the training through each upazilla, so that every village in the Comilla district would eventually have a trained resource person.

The Rotary Project Committee made available to each of the trainees a loan of 20,000 Taka (\$1,000), on the basis that it was better to give the money as a loan rather than as a grant, giving each of them pride of ownership of an asset which they were being helped to develop. Loans were given through the Government Bank in May, 1984. By the end of January, 1985 seven farmers had already repaid their first instalment of about 8,000 Taka from the income they had derived from the sales of carp fry to other farmers. One trainee, Abdus Razzak, had trained 70 people living around his farm, and had given employment to 150 men.

The 1985 intake of 32 trainees had completed their training at the Chandpur Freshwater Fisheries Institute when Ray de Zylva visited the project that year. He estimated that over 5.6 million fry had been raised in 1984. The Government bought several thousand common carp fry to stock a hydroelectric dam in the Chittagong Hills. At one farm the fry were being packed in polythene bags, half filled with oxygen from a cylinder, for transport on the bus to markets over a hundred kilometers away.

In an article published in The Gisborne Herald on 2 August, 1985 he wrote: "Three of the 1984 trainees who had between them 8 ponds (in extent 2.25 hectares) have leased 83 ponds (in extent 35 hectares) for their 1985 operations. This gives some indication of the benefits realised from the first year of

intensive fish farming in which they have been engaged. It is possible that fry production in 1985 will exceed 25 million, and that in 1986 the number of trainees will be about 60, by which time trainees will be functioning in 110 upazillas in the Comilla district."

I visited one of these farms in 1994, the farmer well established as a successful small businessman – one of hundreds who have benefited from the project. The photos accompanying this report, which I took on my visit, give some indication of the yield of fresh fish from the intensive farming methods practised.

It was an eye-opener to me. It's not just a case of tossing some fingerlings into the pond, waiting for them to grow, then scooping them out. The ponds have to be dried out periodically, cleaned, and the pond beds fertilised.

The major Indian and Chinese carps will not breed in ponds. They require the stimulus of flowing water, so eight spouts are placed around the perimeter of the circular tanks, fed by gravitational flow from overhead tanks. The specially reared brood fish have to be induced to spawn when they are ripe by injection of hormone extracted from the pituitary glands of fish which have been used for food, collected by the women when they are preparing the fish for cooking. It really is a scientific business.

I also learned that each pond also contains a number of varieties of fish – some feeding in the surface layers, some in midwater and some at the bottom, each specie having differing eating habits, each complementing the other.

Apart from the obvious, there are other spin-off benefits of the program.

- The banks used to finance fish farmers at 20% to 25%. Rotary has made money available to them at 8%.
- Village farmers who have had to go many miles for supplies of fry for their ponds are now able to get their requirements in full from local trainees' ponds.
- An ever increasing number of people are getting involved in fish farming, and the general awareness of the advantages of the new techniques is spreading.
- Even if they have not been able to get on the training course, farmers are coming to the trainees for technical advice.

- Some villages have developed community centres, where adult education classes are teaching people to read and write, and health and family planning information is made available through visiting paramedics.

The 3H Grant was for five years – but the benefit to the people of Bangladesh will endure for years, in increasing measure, because a man in far away New Zealand realised in his Rotary membership the opportunity to use the organisational structure of The Rotary Foundation to benefit others.

Sight Restoration and Blindness Prevention Program

Bali, Indonesia

This is the story of a relatively modest 3H Grant of US\$157,545 (A\$198,252) which over a nine year period funded a program to the extent of A\$1,109,059, touched the lives of thousands, and established on the island of Bali a permanent health facility by converting a former leprosy hospital to become an eye hospital.

Using surplus medical equipment from Australia, sophisticated eye surgery is performed, and local ophthalmologists are trained – all from a much more modest plan to convert a Mazda bus into a two bed operating theatre with trailer, to function as a mobile clinic to serve the isolated villages of the island. Today thousands who would otherwise be blind have the gift of sight – more than 14,000 to date – at a cost of A\$50 per patient for cataract operations.

John Hollingshead, the Governor of District 9450 (Western Australia) in 1989-90, has been the driving force behind the project.

Since the first cataract operation in May 1991:

- Sight has been restored to more than 14,000 poor men, women and children and more implant operations performed than anywhere else in Indonesia.

- The project has established the best-equipped and organised Community Eye Care Hospital outside of Jakarta, from which the mobile clinic visits rural areas and schools.

- The Eye Centre is available to all Balinese ophthalmologists who conduct regular weekly clinics.

- The local doctors and nurses benefit from the best possible scientific instruments and gain up to date training from visiting Australian, UK and American counterparts. During 1998 three Rotary volunteer ophthalmologists contributed 15 weeks of training.

- An eye diseases prevention program in primary schools (a new initiative) has enabled some 100,000 children to benefit.

- The introduction of corneal grafting has given sight to 50 otherwise blind persons. Grafts come from the International Eye Bank in Colombo (Sri Lanka).

- The West Australian Optometrists Association is providing technical assistance to establish skills in optometry and refraction.

- Through the use of 6 Hercules Aircraft and HMAS Darwin, the public hospitals have virtually been re-equipped, a major item being the installation of and training in the use of a C.T. whole body scanner.

- A large number of hospital beds and wheel chairs, a dental operating unit, school furniture, solar powered water pump and 100,000 litre tank (funded from matching grant 9919) and laser operating equipment (funded from matching grant 9719) were, at the time of writing, waiting to be air-lifted to Bali.

On the Sight Restoration Program alone (there are other related projects) a total of \$819,715 had been expended to 30 June, 1999, the principal items being –

Purchase of the second hand bus and conversion to mobile clinic	\$ 61,285
Establishment, maintenance and operating costs of the Mobile Clinic and Eye Hospital	425,460
Scientific and operating instruments	125,889
Medical supplies	50,961
Transfer of Technology to the project	115,678

Where did the money come from to do all this? Here are the principal sources (All figures in Australian \$) –

Rotary Foundation 3H Grant	198,252
Rotary Foundation Matching Grants	97,677
Rotary Clubs	<u>236,242</u>
	<u>532,171</u>

AIDAB/Aus/AID	244,188
Donations	77,369
The Paul Hamlyn Foundation, London	60,927
Project Raffle	40,998

I give these figures, not because of my interest in financial statements as an accountant, but because of my admiration for a man and his committee who can build upon a relatively modest grant to expand their initial project to accomplish so much.

The commitment of Rotarians to improve the eye care of Bali's 2.8 million people – more than 47,000 of whom are blind – continues strong.

- Local Rotarians work with government medical services and serve on a clinic management committee, while Australian Rotarians help administer the project and purchase equipment as needed.

- Rotary Foundation Volunteer Sister Patricia Canning (a member of the Rotary Club of Cunderdin – district 9460) shared her expertise in surgical theatre control and sterilisation with mobile clinic staff for eight weeks in 1995 and two weeks in 1996.

- Viji Veeman, also a nurse and a member of the Rotary Club of Hollywood (Western Australia, not California), provided ophthalmic nurse training to clinic staff for five weeks in 1996.

What, then, of the future? The Indonesian Government agreed to accept responsibility from May, 1999, but due to the intervention of presidential elections and subsequent problems that date has had to be postponed. Meanwhile, \$3,000 per month has to be found to provide for the cost of 95 intra ocular lens cataract operations, seven Pterygium operations, 10 glaucoma operations and treatments, eye examinations for about 1,200 patients at the eye hospital, 1,000 in rural villages, screening of 1,200 primary school children, and at least 650 patients to receive free spectacles from the recently-established optometry department.

At present Bali's hospital system is able to treat only about 10 per cent of people suffering from cataracts. However, the success of the Mobile Clinic for Cataract Surgery has spawned the establishment of the Community Eye Care and Blindness Prevention Centre, which opened its first clinic in 1996 in the

former Leprosy Hospital in Denpasar. The entire hospital building is available to the centre, with the mobile clinic serving as the facility's outreach program in rural areas.

The centre is staffed by Indonesian doctors and nurses who have benefited greatly from the transfer of medical technology and equipment from Australia and other parts of the world. For example, Rotary clubs in Indonesia and Alaska teamed up to purchase a YAG laser for the centre, funded in part by a US\$7,500 Matching Grant.

Seventeen metric tons (18.7 tons) of modern medical equipment has been donated by the people of Western Australia to Bali's public health system, delivered free of charge by the Australian Defence Forces.

The accompanying photos demonstrate, much more effectively than words or figures, the impact upon the lives of so many people because of just one of the hundreds of 3H projects which have been the vehicle for service of men like John Hollingshead, his fellow Rotarians in District 9450, including the original Sponsor Club (West Perth) and Hon. Rotarian John Fawcett, the Project Co-ordinator in Bali.

The Program and Literacy

Significant though the PolioPlus program is as an outcome of the 3H program, I believe the Literacy program which it has spawned may well be its most beneficial and long-lasting program because of its fundamental importance, not only to the present generation of the world's more than one billion illiterate people, but also to succeeding generations who will inherit the priceless gift of literacy.

To date approximately US\$4,000,000 has been invested in 6,442,000 students who have received literacy teaching; and an estimated 150,000 teachers have been trained. But it should be remembered that the literacy programs that are set up continue to benefit new students year after year. In Thailand, for example, hundreds of thousands of new children enter what is recognised as "The Rotary Program" each year, and with new school projects the numbers multiply each year as the program moves up the grades.

No history of the 3H program would be complete, therefore, without an account of the birth and development (to this stage)

of the Literacy program – and no one better qualified to write it than the man who has devoted a large slice of his life to make it happen. So I invited him to write the story. When I received the manuscript, I realised how little it said directly of his own personal involvement. I have therefore taken the liberty of writing a foreword, paying a brief but inadequate tribute to the man and his commitment to the task. For if it be true that any great institution is but the lengthened shadow of one person, then so far as The Rotary Foundation's Literacy Program is concerned that person is Past District Governor Dr. Richard F. (Dick) Walker of District 9630.

The Concentrated Language Encounter (CLE) teaching strategies being used by the Literacy and Numeracy Task Force were developed over a seven year period by one of his research staff when he was Director of the Research and Learning Centre in Reading at the Mt. Gravatt (Brisbane) College of Advanced Education – designed to overcome almost 100% failure of Aboriginal children to learn to read and write in a school in Alice Springs.

The opportunity to use this new methodology world-wide came with the presentation of a paper to the Peace through Education Committee appointed by Carlos Canseco during his presidency. From there it was recommended to the Trustees of The Rotary Foundation, its introduction to Thailand on a trial basis supported by a Matching Grant, and later by a 3H Grant of \$640,000.

When he was asked by the Srinakharinwirot University in 1985 to help set up a reading centre and courses in the teaching of reading, he took the CLE methodology to Thailand as a promising means of solving their huge problem of mass educational failure across the border provinces. The most important aspect of his early work was the development of the key people who were concerned with the project, so that they would be able to carry on alone. This involved spending extensive periods of time in Thailand, and bringing a few key project personnel to Australia each year to give them intensive briefing and training for the task ahead.

Work with teachers involved a nine hour train journey to the town of Surin, motor transport out to distant schools, and then an overnight return journey to Bangkok. They were working in

a very poor region, with people literally starving and no clean water at some schools. The weather was taxing, and there were health risks for westerners such as Dick and Fay.

The Thai-language and English-language Rotary projects in Thailand involved one visit and sometimes two each year (1986 to 1996). At the beginning the full-time commitment was three months in Thailand plus a month in Australia, but visits decreased in length to six, five and then four weeks.

But Thailand was not the only country in which he worked. His is a household name among educationists in Turkey, South Africa, Kenya, Brazil, Bangladesh, Argentina, Egypt, The Solomon Islands, India – wherever there are people, young or old, who need help to learn to read and write.

I know of no Rotary Volunteer who has given more generously of his time and substance continuously over so many years following his Rotary dream. It began in 1984-85 with the pilot project in Thailand. It ended (officially) 14 years later, although he continues as an unofficial consultant to the Literacy Task Force. During the whole of that time he criss-crossed the world setting up literacy programs – building "Lighthouses" to demonstrate to national governments what can be accomplished to lift the burden of illiteracy from those who have no hope in life without the ability to read and write.

No one knows better than his wife Fay what that has involved, for she travelled with him (at no cost to Rotary) as often as they could afford it. Dick once described her as "a key member of the administrative back-up team for training and like events and as my most valuable aide during workshops etc."

Dick's invaluable contribution to literacy has been widely acknowledged and recognised. The Rotarians of Thailand adopted him as one of their own and, on the occasion of the conferring of an honorary Doctorate in Education by the Srinakharinwirot University in 1982, placed full-page advertisements in all the major newspapers in Thailand honouring him as "an outstanding educator of the highest calibre, worthy of the highest acclaim". In Australia that same year the AM was conferred on him. He was a keynote speaker at meetings such as the R.I. Convention at Seoul, R.I. Conferences for Development, the 1990 UNESCO Regional Conference on Literacy for All, and the

1991 World Congress of the International Reading Association in Maui.

Who better qualified to place on record a brief history of the development to date of the 3H Literacy Program? Here it is, in his own words –

The 3H Literacy Program

by Dick Walker

From the earliest years of the 3-H Program, it was realised that permanent relief of widespread problems in health and poverty depended on elimination of mass illiteracy, and the Trustees of The Rotary Foundation set up adult literacy as a priority as early as 1980.

As a first step in fostering wider Rotary participation in literacy projects. The Rotary Foundation funded the publication and distribution of the Rotary Source Book *The Right to Read: Literacy Around the World*. This book, published in 1985, was a report on literacy in eleven large Rotary countries from all major regions of the world. It played a major part in arousing awareness among Rotarians of the likelihood that there were literacy problems within their own country. Then General Secretary Herbert Pigman expressed, in his preface to the book, the hope "that this Rotary sourcebook will provide perspective, background, inspiration, and initial guidance for Rotary clubs and districts interested in helping to eliminate the scourge of illiteracy around the world." This was the first enunciation of what many Rotarians now see as Rotary's objective in literacy.

The following extracts from *The Right To Read* presented aspects of the literacy problem that are still of central importance:

In developing countries, people are usually poor because they lack education. They have no opportunity to get educated because they are poor. It is a vicious circle.

The importance of reaching a solution to the worldwide problem of illiteracy is generally recognised in principle. But when it comes to practical action many delicate problems arise that lead to difficulties and inertia (Introduction).

Illiteracy is no longer a prerogative of developing countries. The map of illiteracy closely covers the map of poverty.

A person is functionally literate only if his literacy skills allow him to meet the social, vocational, or civic demands of his society. And such demands are changing at a rapid rate.

The high motivation for learning is an expression of the daily pressure to be literate and the longing for independence . . . [Illiterates] want to be able to fill in forms, to write checks and handle menus, travel plans or applications for jobs.

Learning to read and write can only be successful when the adult . . . liberates himself from the stigma of being considered stupid or unintelligent . . . Only as a second step will learning take place through the reading of words or letters. The first step will be the incentive for the second.

The RI Board of 1985-86 also moved quickly in approving a program to improve literacy, as a ten-year emphasis of Rotary International, and in that same and subsequent years, "ad hoc" Literacy Promotion Committees were appointed to make recommendations to the board concerning encouragement of clubs and districts to participate in literacy projects. Those committees addressed themselves to projects for functionally illiterate adults in the local community and also international service projects aimed at alleviation of mass illiteracy in developing countries. Their reports emphasised the interrelationship between literacy projects and the pursuit of individual Rotarians in literacy projects at home and in other countries, the desirability of enlarging the employment of programs of The Rotary Foundation for assisting literacy projects, and the need for Rotary clubs and districts to offer co-operation with governments, education authorities and voluntary organisations in developing countries.

The 1985-86 ad hoc Literacy Promotion Committee foreshadowed what was to come a decade later, in the following passage from its final report:

But, from the beginning . . . the committee sees a necessity . . . for the encouragement of new, more ambitious projects at club and district levels. It is envisaged that . . . Rotary may be ready, before the end of the ten-year peri-

od of emphasis, to consider major programs for the improvement of levels of literacy throughout the entire Rotary world.

Thailand

The origin of the "major programs" that emerged within Rotary were in a Rotary Foundation Matching Grant literacy project that began in four schools in a region of Thailand called the Esarn, in that same year, 1984-85. The Esarn is a region of poverty, mass illiteracy and gross failure in the schools. A small pilot project in literacy, in 1985-86, led in the following year to the first 3H literacy project, to spread the Rotary literacy program that had been developed in the pilot project to hundreds of schools in four provinces of the Esarn. Key features of the dramatic success of the Rotary project were the use of the "lighthouse" strategy and of Concentrated Language Encounter (CLE) teaching techniques. Within Thailand, the "lighthouse" effect was that the success of the Rotary literacy program in four provinces influenced the national government to spread it across the entire country, so that it reached the last of the government schools in that nation of 60 million people by 1997. Internationally, the lighthouse effect resulted in projects, again with a nationwide focus, in Bangladesh, Laos and the Solomon Islands. The success of these replicatory projects was virtually assured through having project leaders in Thailand train the prospective project leaders and provide follow-up technical support at crucial stages.

The outcomes from the first 3H literacy project in Thailand, in terms of improving literacy teaching across the schools of an entire nation, and then in providing inspiration and technical support for replication projects in other countries were more than anyone could reasonably have expected of one 3H project, but more was to come. A brief account of the second 3H literacy project, begun in Bangladesh in 1997, illustrates the possibilities that had now opened up for Rotary to make a significant contribution to the alleviation of mass illiteracy.

The Bangladesh 3H Literacy Project

Large scale Rotary literacy work in Bangladesh resulted from a visit that the then President of the Rotary Club of Dhaka, Emdad Ul Haq, made to Thailand to investigate the 3H literacy work there. A project co-ordinator from the Bangladesh Ministry of Education was subsequently trained in Thailand, and after three years of pilot work in 33 schools, a successful application for a 3H Grant was made for the years 1997-2001.

The objectives of the project are to develop and implement an effective CLE literacy program in elementary school grades one to five. That will involve:-

- training some 10,000 teachers and other educators,
- developing Starter Books and supplying many thousands of copies of them to schools, and
- conducting dissemination seminars and workshops to assist the government to spread the program.

At the end of 1999, the project is on schedule and undoubtedly succeeding, with:-

- 4000 teachers already trained, in Grades 1 to 5,
- 163,000 students being taught within the project,
- 50,000 copies of Starter Books printed, with 15,500 already in use, and
- 37 Rotary clubs in Bangladesh involved in the work.

The Ministry of Education of Bangladesh has committed itself to spreading the program to all other parts of this country of 110 million people as quickly as resources allow, following completion of the 3H project.

The 3H Literacy Project in the Solomon Islands

Again through the efforts of Rotarians and clubs in Australia and Thailand, the possibility of helping to relieve mass illiteracy and educational failure in the 11 nations of the South Pacific was explored with the University of the South Pacific, Fiji, which has a presence in each of those countries.

Successful pilot work was done in the Solomon Islands in a Matching Grant project, sponsored by Rotary clubs in Districts 9800 and 9600, Australia. A 3H literacy project, aimed at developing an effective CLE literacy program and introducing it to all the elementary schools in the nation has now been run-

ning for two years. The CLE methodology has been introduced into all provinces of the Solomon Islands and the Rotary program is very popular throughout the teaching profession. Sound training capability has already developed in the Solomon Islands and within the University of the South Pacific so that technical support will be available for further projects in other countries of the South Pacific.

Meanwhile, the government of Laos, using World Bank funding, also drew on the expertise of Dr. Rattanavich, in Thailand, to develop a similar literacy program for use in its elementary schools. That work is in its third year.

The Rotary International Literacy and Numeracy Task Force

This persistent dedication to the Lighthouse Strategy by Rotarians in Thailand and Australia during the early 1990's demonstrated that it was possible for Rotary to make a significant contribution to the fight to alleviate mass illiteracy, through systematic extension and replication of what had been achieved in Asia. Interest in large-scale Rotary literacy projects gathered force during the early 1990's and a new phase began in 1997 when RI President Glen Kinross set up a Literacy and Numeracy Task Force.

As it began its work in July, 1998, the Task Force identified four types of programs that were needed in countries where there was mass illiteracy. They were:

1. Programs for children in schools.
2. Programs for illiterate adults, with an emphasis on women.
3. Programs for older children who had missed out on formal schooling.
4. Programs for special groups, such as the disabled and migrant workers.

The Task Force adopted the CLE techniques for program development, teacher training and program implementation that had proved so successful in the three 3H literacy projects. It also resolved to employ the lighthouse strategy to inspire and foster literacy projects, using the expertise that had already been developed in Thailand and elsewhere.

It saw its work as proceeding through three phases:

1. Establishing effective projects of the various kinds in each region of the developing world.

2. Supporting the spread of that work more widely within the nations where it is located.

3. Finally, developing "lighthouse capacity" in every region of the developing world to generate and support similar work in other countries of that region.

Accordingly, it systematically fostered literacy projects across the developing world and provided training and continued guidance for sponsors and project team leaders in accordance with the strategies that the Task Force had adopted. In the words of the General Co-ordinator: "There are no doubt other strategies that may work, but we know that these will certainly work — that has been proved beyond doubt in Thailand, Bangladesh, Laos and the Solomon Islands and it is being confirmed in every pilot project that we have set up."

In two and a half years, the Task Force has made very substantial progress towards its overall objective of establishing a basis from which Rotary can make a significant worldwide contribution to the alleviation of mass illiteracy, and it was greatly encouraged in 1998-99, when the board declared Literacy and Numeracy a Pilot Program of Rotary. A brief sketch of the unfolding program of the Task Force will reveal something of the scale and complexity of the work of the Task Force over that time.

a Generating pilot projects across the developing world

In 1997, the General Co-ordinator of the Task Force, Dick Walker, conducted workshops for Zone Co-ordinators and local educators in Cape Town (for sub-Saharan Africa), Caracas (for Latin America), and Cairo (for the north Africa-Mediterranean area), and Area Co-ordinator Noraseth Pathmanand did the same for Asia. In all, proposals for some 200 projects, spread across all project types and geographic regions, were received during that year and approximately half of them were endorsed by the Task Force following consultancy input.

b Rotary Partners

The proposal of these projects required the efforts of

Rotarians in industrialised countries such as Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, Canada and Taiwan in finding hundreds of thousands of dollars of sponsorship as well as closer involvement by clubs and districts in countries where the projects were to be located. Task Force Co-ordinators in industrialised countries, as well as those in developing countries, played an essential role in the work.

c Training "Technical Co-ordinators"

Early in its work, the Task Force realised that the training of the leaders of project teams (Technical Co-ordinators) was of primary importance and, for the first two years, that training was funded by the Board of R.I., Technical Co-ordinators being trained in Thailand in conformity with the Lighthouse Strategy. Meanwhile, the Task Force worked towards the longer-term objective of developing capacity to train Technical Co-ordinators in every part of the developing world.

d Providing Technical Support

During the first two years, a lot of effort was put into developing project guidelines, training programs and supporting literature for projects of the kinds being targeted – projects for school children, for adults, for street children and for special groups such as disabled children and illiterate migrants. The following twelve booklets and three videos were produced and distributed by the Task Force to provide guidance for the establishing and conduct of projects. Translations of key booklets were produced by members of the Task Force in Turkey and Latin America.

Booklets

- G1: *General Guidelines for Starting Up Pilot Projects*
- G2: *Guidelines for Starting Up Literacy Programs for Adults in Developing Countries*
- G3: *Guidelines for CLE Projects for Street Children*
- G4: *Guidelines for Evaluation of CLE Pilot Projects*
- M1: *A Teachers Manual for CLE Teaching of Beginners*
- M2: *A Teachers Manual for CLE Teaching of the Middle Grades*
- M3: *A Manual for Training Teachers in Concentrated Language Encounter Techniques*

- M4: *A Manual for Training Trainers for CLE Projects*
- M5: *A Handbook for Co-ordinators of Rotary CLE Projects*
- R1: *The Context of Adult Literacy: A Framework for Thought about Adult Basic Education and Literacy in Developing Countries*
- R2: *Street Children and Literacy Education: An Innovative Approach to the Education of Street Children*
- R3: *Towards a Better Life: Functional Numeracy with Functional Literacy*

Videos

The Lighthouse Strategy: Model A Concentrated Language Encounter Teaching Method.

The Lighthouse Strategy: Model II Concentrated Language Encounter Teaching Method

Keep It Lit! (A promotional video).

Visits

The Board of RI also funded technical support visits after projects had been started up, and later visits to evaluate clusters of pilot projects and to help with preparation for expansion of the work.

General Co-ordinator Dick Walker made visits to Brazil, Turkey (2), Egypt (2), the Solomon Islands, and South Africa, Zone Co-ordinator Dr. Saowalak Rattanavich (a highly experienced educator) made visits to India, South Africa and Turkey and Egypt, and Task Force Co-ordinators Noraseth Pathmanand and Neil Adamson made a consultancy visit to Nepal.

Outcomes

NORTHERN AFRICA-MEDITERRANEAN

By the end of 1999, there were 92 teachers conducting 57 classes for illiterate adults in eight Governates in co-operation with the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Education and the General Organisation for Literacy for Adults and 243 graduates had already received certificates after completing a CLE Literacy course. In co-operation with the G.O.L.A., literary classes will also be set up in the Governates of Cairo, Fayoum

and Sharkeya. Capability of training Technical Co-ordinators for projects for illiterates adults now exists in both Turkey and Egypt, and this will be used to support similar work in other countries of this Area.

There are interesting differences in the circumstances in which projects in these two countries are being conducted. In Turkey, experienced elementary school teachers are incorporating life skills into their literacy programs, while in Egypt, people who are experienced in teaching craft and vocational skills are being trained to build a literacy program on to the teaching of vocation or craft skills. Consequently each has unique experiences and insights to share with the prospective project co-ordinators that they train. There is a very effective national Rotary Literacy Committee in Egypt to co-ordinate the work and liaise with co-operating government departments and NGO's, so that self-sufficiency is not far distant as regards the establishment of functional literacy programs for adults in this part of the world.

Applications to The Rotary Foundation for a 3H Grant to extend this work nationwide have been submitted from both of these countries.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Eastern Cape Province-South Africa

A Project for Adults

In Guguleta/Khyalitssha the CLE method is being used in conjunction with the Amey Biel Foundation.

A Project for Schools

Four technical advisors and 44 teachers were trained for programs in schools allocated by the provincial government. The entire teacher-training program was completed and the program begun in four months. The provincial Department of Education completed an in-depth inspection, the results of which were very favourable, the teachers of the second grade were then trained, and the program is expected to continue up the school grades, year by year.

WESTERN CAPE-SOUTH AFRICA

Projects for Schools

A pilot project involving nine government schools has been very productive and is ready for expansion across the province. That will depend of course on whether or not the application for a Rotary Foundation 3H Grant is approved in 2000.

A replication project has also been launched in Namibia, with 19 grade 1 teachers trained in five pilot schools.

Projects for Street Children

A project for street children has been established in conjunction with the City Mission of Cape Town and promises to be highly successful. Two project co-ordinators, teachers from the City Mission and 18 teachers have been trained within this project.

KENYA

Projects for Street Children

The Rotary Club of Nairobi has embarked on a project in conjunction with the Rotary Village Corps and pilot programs for street children have been set up in co-operation with Rotaractors and Interactors. A program for children who have missed formal schooling has also been launched in the slum areas of Kawangware and Krogochi in co-operation with the Desai Foundation and Braeburn School.

Projects for Illiterate Adults

The project co-ordinators aim to have four adult literacy projects established in Mombassa before July 2000.

An adult literacy program has also been established in Southern Sudan, the costs of travel being met by an international donor.

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil

Projects for Children in Schools

There are very successful projects in schools in a number of places in Brazil. Of particular note is the one that is centred on Contagem and described in the "snapshot" from Brazil.

In Curitiba, projects have been set up in three different locations with the co-operation of the Secretary of Education.

The Department of Education supplies the teachers, and the Technical Co-ordinator is a University Professor who is able to use the facilities at the University for teacher training workshops and seminars.

Proposals for projects have been received from many other Rotary clubs and districts in Brazil, as far north as Belem, near the Amazon River, and as far south as Porto Alegre. A promising project for illiterate adults began in March, 1999 in Sao Paulo, one of the largest cities in the world. 200 students are being taught in nine classrooms that were allocated by the authorities in six different public schools in various parts of the city. Rita Correa da Costa (wife of Past R.I. President Paulo da Costa) regularly attends classes and liaises with the Government. Rita's quote: "It's a tremendous fight, but with faith and enthusiasm we'll certainly make it"

ARGENTINA

Programs for Adult Rural Workers

The Rotary Club of Santa Rosa Norte has set up a literacy program for adults in rural areas in co-operation with Ministry of Education of the Province of La Pampa. A co-ordinator, who was trained in the CLE method in Bangkok, visited ranches and farms, talking to the farmers and making a first approach to the illiterate rural workers. The local Rural Union and the Town City actively collaborated in the implementation of the project, and it has been very successful so that the Ministry of Culture and Education is evaluating the program with a view to spreading it throughout the province.

A similar project has been successfully launched by the Rotary Club of San Juan.

ASIA-INDIA

Projects for Children in Schools

The Rotarians in India have done a splendid job with submitting accurate applications and the local Rotary clubs have risen to the challenge of funding numerous Lighthouse Pilot Projects. Matching Grants have been provided for nine projects in south-

ern India alone, involving 348 schools, and 35,000 children are on their way to becoming literate members of society.

The Philippines

The first pilot project in the Philippines is located in Pagadian and Mindanao, within an educationally difficult region of the country. The main program began in January 2000, but the two project co-ordinators, who are key personnel in "hub" schools, successfully implemented the program in their own schools during the previous year. It is confidently anticipated that this Pilot program will become the Lighthouse program for the nation of the Philippines.

Nepal

A matching grant project for schools began in schools of Damauli and Patan in 1999. Members of the Rotary Clubs of Damauli and South Patan make regular monitoring and support visits to the pilot schools in spite of the severe difficulties of travel in this mountainous region. The overseas sponsor is District 9650, Australia, and Area Co-ordinator PDG Neil Adamson attended the first evaluator training workshop of the Task Force to prepare for his consultancy task in Nepal.

THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Vanuatu

Following the success of the 3H literacy project in the Solomon Islands, the Ministry of Education of Vanuatu invited the introduction of the CLE methodology into the nation's primary schools and the first pilot project began in January 2000 on the island of Santo.

Literacy and 3H Projects

There are many more pilot projects - the total either funded or awaiting funding had passed the 100 mark at last count. Certainly there are enough to ensure that large Rotary "lighthouse" projects can be developed in every region of the developing world submitted at present from Brazil (schools), Egypt (adults),

Turkey (adults), and South Africa (schools and adults), and there are clusters of pilot projects in other countries from which large-scale projects are very likely to grow. For example, there are numerous projects and prospective projects for children from rural villages and city slums in southern and eastern India, each project involving an average of 20 schools. Pilot projects that have been set up in Nepal, Bengal, Nigeria, Kenya, the Philippines, Thailand, Vanuatu, and Argentina are also very likely to lead to projects that require large-scale funding.

The tendency to form national or provincial Rotary literacy co-ordinating committees to work in co-operation with government and other education agencies, as in Egypt, Turkey, South Africa and Brazil, will also result in plans for large national or regional Rotary Literacy projects.

Because of the interrelationship between literacy projects and improvement in other aspects of life for disadvantaged populations, however, most Rotarians who have worked in literacy see an ever-increasing overlap between literacy projects and other projects. For that reason, they do not favour a separate fund for literacy projects, however large and numerous they may become. Instead, they favour 3H funding for Rotary Lighthouse Literacy Projects with extension of the work across whole nations, following the success of the 3H project, being funded by international agencies such as UNESCO and the World Bank or by foundations set up by international companies.

Rotary cannot teach every illiterate person in the world any more than it can feed, house and clothe the world's poor. However, it can show that it can be done and how to do it at relatively low cost, as happened with mass immunisation against diseases of childhood.

Through its dramatically successful use of the Lighthouse Strategy and CLE techniques for literacy teaching of all kinds over the last few years, R.I.'s Literacy and Numeracy Task Force has made it possible for Rotary to undertake that leadership role in combating mass illiteracy. A foundation now exists from which Rotary can truly make a significant contribution to the alleviation of mass illiteracy and thereby, to the building of

a better world for the new century within the 3H program of Rotary.

Postscript

Where to from here ?

In 1990 I spent a couple of weeks in Antarctica. One of the unforgettable sights of that journey was the Mertz glacier – a huge finger of ice jutting out 60 miles into the ocean, under pressure from the enormous energy generated by the accumu-



lation of ice on the Antarctic continent, giving birth to spectacular ice bergs shaken loose by the restless seas and the rise and fall of the ocean.

In some respects the 3H program is like the Mertz glacier – drawing its energy from a resource which remained frozen for 73 years, but which now exerts increasing pressure to propel Rotary into the turbulent waters of a troubled world.

Our participation in programs such as PolioPlus, Literacy and dozens of smaller projects has demonstrated our capacity and our willingness to give birth to major projects – and Rotary clubs are applying increasing pressure to launch them.

At the 1980 Council on Legislation in Delhi, in Resolutions referred to the Board of R.I., there was evidence of the rising expectations of clubs and districts to come to grips with major problems, among them:–

- World Population and Development
- Control of Malaria