Copyright

by

Michael Richard Anderson

2009

The Dissertation Committee for Michael Richard Anderson Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Pacific Dreams: The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Struggle for the Mind of Asia

Committee:

____
Wm. Roger Louis, Supervisor

____
Kimberly A. Alidio

____
H.W. Brands

____
Mark A. Lawrence

____
Michael B. Stoff

____
Peter Trubowitz

Pacific Dreams: The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Struggle for the Mind of Asia

by

Michael Richard Anderson, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2009

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many individuals and institutions over the past several years. I first want to thank my adviser, Wm. Roger Louis, whose British Studies seminar has provided an intellectual home for this wayward Americanist from the very beginning of my graduate student career at the University of Texas at Austin. Other committee members—Drs. Kim Alidio, Bill Brands, Mark Lawrence, Michael Stoff and Peter Trubowitz—were uniformly helpful in providing excellent feedback on draft chapters, and in encouraging me in ways large and small over the years. All of their comments and questions have strengthened this dissertation and have contributed to my growth as a historian. I also wish to thank Dr. Paul Hooper of the University of Hawaii, who offered useful advice in the early stages of conceptualizing the project and read the entire manuscript upon its completion.

Timely financial support was a critical ingredient in the successful realization of this project. The Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History and the Rockefeller Archive Center each provided research fellowships that facilitated travel to New York City. The National History Center's International Decolonization Seminar offered a stimulating month-long reading and writing workshop in Washington, DC that allowed me to examine materials in the Library of Congress and the United States National Archives in College Park, MD. Finally, a Glenn Morris Rodgers fellowship from the

University of Texas provided the funds for trips to archives in Canada, Great Britain and France. For my stay in London, I remain particularly grateful to Tom Bruxner, who cheerfully housed and fed his American cousin for a few weeks in the autumn of 2007.

Back in Austin, the writing of the dissertation was aided substantially through my participation in an informal graduate student writing group with Eric Busch, Hervey and Dianne Priddy, and Erica Whittington. Their careful line-edits and probing questions helped sharpen my analysis, and our weekly meetings invariably helped bolster my confidence in the project. Thanks as well to those who preceded me in completing their doctoral degrees—especially Saad Abi-Hamad, Chris Albi, Lauren Apter, Adrian Howkins and Brandon Marsh—for providing such good friendship during my time at the University of Texas.

In closing, I wish to recognize my family. My parents, Rick and Betsy Anderson, have never wavered in their support for my endeavors. With them behind me, I have always known that all things are possible. Meanwhile, my wife, Kate Rowe, has lived with this study since its inception. At times it no doubt seemed like an uninvited guest at the dinner table. More than any other factor, her steadfastness and patience over these past years helped me see the dissertation through its completion. My gratitude to her is exceeded only by my love.

Michael Richard Anderson

Austin, Texas

August 2009

Pacific Dreams: The Institute of Pacific Relations and
the Struggle for the Mind of Asia

Publication No._____________

Michael Richard Anderson, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

Supervisor: Wm. Roger Louis

This dissertation examines the efforts of Pacific internationalists in the years during and after World War II to forge private intellectual connections between the West and Asia. One of the most prominent groups in this movement was the Institute of Pacific Relations (1925-61), an international non-governmental organization that nurtured a trans-Pacific community of scholars, businessmen and diplomats through research projects and international conferences. In evaluating the work of these internationalists during the postwar period, this dissertation challenges conventional Cold War historiography that has marginalized such cooperative efforts during these years. Previous scholarship concerning the Institute of Pacific Relations has noted the way in which the organization fell victim to anti-communist politics in the United States, yet no studies have examined the records of its postwar conferences, which reveal an active international agenda well into the 1950s. The support of Asian members for such trans-Pacific ties, moreover, provides a counter-narrative to the story of revolutionary nationalism and third-world

solidarity among emerging Asian and African countries during this period. The Institute of Pacific Relations acted as a valuable asset in the struggle for the "mind of Asia," this dissertation argues, largely because its leadership did not conform to the prevailing Cold War mindset. As a private international organization, the IPR provided a venue for unofficial dialogue among private elites who at once confronted and transcended the geopolitical restrictions of their time. In maintaining private East-West partnerships through such turbulent years, these Pacific internationalists set the stage for regional cooperative ventures to flourish later in the twentieth century.

Table of Contents

Introduction ... 1

"The Struggle for the Mind of Asia" ... 6

The Institute of Pacific Relations ... 11

Chapter Outline ... 17

Chapter One: The New Diplomacy in the Pacific, 1919-37 ... 23

The New Internationalists ... 24

Establishing the IPR ... 29

Evolving Conceptions of the Pacific ... 39

Edward Carter's Institute ... 46

Chapter Two: "A True New Order": Pacific Internationalists at War, 1938-45 ... 59

Post-War Worlds ... 62

India and the Pacific ... 69

Wartime China and the IPR ... 80

Chapter Three: Internationalism in Flux: Europe and the IPR, 1945-47 91

Communism and Internationalism ... 93

The Hot Springs Conference, 1945 ... 99

Removing Edward Carter ... 107

The Stratford Conference, 1947 ... 114

Chapter Four: "Something to Join": Asia and the IPR, 1947-50 ... 119

The Asian Relations Conference, 1947 ... 121

Evangelizing the IPR ... 128

The Lucknow Conference, 1950 ... 138

Chapter Five: "Machinations": The IPR and the McCarthy Moment, 1950-52 ... 149

Anti-Communism and the American IPR ... 152

McCarthy and the "China Lobby" ... 159

The McCarran Hearings..164
McCarran Report and Reaction 171

Chapter Six: "A Body We Cannot Afford to Lose": The IPR and the Bandung Spirit, 1953-55 177
Macadam's Surprise..181
Asian Support..186
The Kyoto Conference, 1954 193
Conclusion 202

Chapter Seven: Rethinking the East-West Connection, 1955-60.......... 206
"A More Coordinated Approach"..208
Establishing the Asia Society..215
The Lahore Conference, 1958..222
The East-West Center: A New Bridge?..229

Epilogue 237

Bibliography 249

Vita….. 259

Introduction

On December 6, 1946, Edward Carter, the long-serving secretary-general of the Institute of Pacific Relations, wrote to Devereux Josephs, the president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, requesting funding for the coming year. For more than 20 years, the Institute of Pacific Relations had been dedicated to the study of Pacific peoples "with a view to the improvement of their mutual relations," according to the group's constitution.[1] Bringing together academics, journalists, businessmen and former governmental officials from three continents, the IPR had held numerous international conferences; published thousands of books, articles and pamphlets; garnered the attention of national leaders and attracted considerable funding from companies and individuals. The aftermath of World War II now required a reassessment of operations based on changing world conditions. Carter explained to Josephs that the emergence of "revolutionary forces" throughout Asia as a result of World War II had unknown consequences. Trans-Pacific cooperation was more essential than ever, the secretary-general reminded his benefactor. Carter left no doubt regarding the potential good his Institute could provide: "In this fluid situation, the IPR recognizes, I hope in all humility, that it is the *only private international organization functioning in this wide area* on whose future depends so many of the issues of war and peace for mankind."[2]

Carter's appeal reflected the ambitious program Pacific internationalists set for themselves at the end of World War II. The Pacific region was at a crossroads: Japan had

---

[1] Constitution of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Appendix III, in J.D. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1927* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 607-610.
[2] Italics added. Edward C. Carter to Devereux C. Josephs, Dec. 6, 1946, in Box 318, "Carnegie Appeals," Pacific Relations files, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

been defeated, European imperialism was on the retreat, and the United States was ascending. "Americans may be amused when Congressman Izak of California[3] shouts from Tokyo that 'The Pacific Ocean is ours'," Carter wrote in his letter to Josephs. "But alas, this American [Izak] with a quaint name is merely the voice of that powerful minority in American life which seeks to make the greatest of oceans into a private American lake." The IPR secretary-general insisted that his Institute was designed to work against such unilateralism, and instead help contribute to building a "cooperative and gracious world society."[4] The following month, Carnegie Corporation officials gave their approval to a $120,000 grant, payable over three years.[5] Carter was optimistic about the ability of his Institute to apply its international agenda into the postwar world.

This dissertation explores the history of trans-Pacific intellectual exchange in the middle decades of the twentieth century, using the Institute of Pacific Relations as the central organizing network of international activity. It argues, first, that Pacific internationalists, working outside of government, played a decisive role in conceptualizing the postwar Asia-Pacific region as a shared project between Western and Asian countries. Through publications and conferences, these non-state internationalists comprised an "epistemic community" whose regionalist vision laid the intellectual groundwork for subsequent cooperative efforts.[6] Second, it argues that this trans-Pacific intellectual network operated in parallel, but not always complementary, fashion to official state machinery during these years. Among the individual national institutes

---

[3] Edouard Izak, a Medal of Honor recipient for his service In World War I, served as a Democratic congressman from California from 1937-1947.

[4] Carter to Josephs, Dec. 6, 1946, in Box 318, "Carnegie Appeals," Pacific Relations files, COL.

[5] Although this represented the largest amount given to the organization, Carnegie officials indicated that this grant would be terminal, as corporation officials were beginning to shift financial support to university-based programs. Robert W. Lester to Edward C. Carter, Jan. 20, 1947, in Box 318, "Carnegie Appeals," Pacific Relations files, COL.

[6] The term "epistemic community" here is used to denote a network of knowledge-based experts that help to shape debate through their professed expertise. Peter M. Haas, "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *International Organization* Vol. 46, No. 1 (Winter 1992): 1-35.

associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations, many leaders maintained intimate ties with their respective foreign ministries, and tried to use the private organization to further their own domestic agendas. Yet the IPR was more than simply a collection of national units. During these years, the IPR's international secretariat maintained a defiantly independent vision of Asian-Pacific relations that often chafed against the regional vision of Western world powers. Although the Institute depended primarily upon U.S. membership and capital, it operated internationally neither as an adjunct to American imperialism in the Pacific nor an appendage to Cold War propaganda. Pacific internationalism, as reflected through the IPR's agenda, thus represented an important counterweight to the dominant political ideologies of the day.

In focusing upon the years of the IPR's operation (1925-1961), this dissertation significantly revises the history of Asia-Pacific regionalism, a literature dominated by economists and political scientists and concentrated almost exclusively on the years since the late 1960s.[7] The emphasis upon the recent past is understandable, given that inter-governmental partnerships in the region have developed only in the last few decades, most notably the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation grouping (established in 1989).[8] From this perspective, scholars have highlighted the relative fragile and contemporary nature of Asia-Pacific regionalism. While they are correct to note that the region is sprawling and diverse,[9] it is unfair to conclude, as some have, that "the Asia-Pacific

---

[7] See, for instance, Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill, eds., *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995); Hadi Soesastro and Christopher Findlay, eds., *Reshaping the Asia Pacific Economic Order* (Oxford: Routledge, 2007); and Derek McDougall, *Asia-Pacific in World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 2007).

[8] For the most complete history of this organization see John Ravenhill, *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[9] Walt. W. Rostow, a champion for Asian regionalism as an adviser to President Lyndon B. Johnson, noted the challenges that effective regional organization at first glance appeared "more absurd than inevitable … not a logical prospect for organization on a reasonably harmonious, cooperative basis." W.W. Rostow, *The United States and the Regional Organization of Asia and the Pacific, 1965-1985* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 18-19.

region … has no history of institutionalized cooperation."[10] In order to resuscitate this story of private intellectual exchange, however, scholars must be willing to expand their perspective back in time, as well as beyond the nation-state. An understanding of the long history of efforts by private elites in Europe, North America and Asia to forge such trans-Pacific connections provides an important corrective to this literature and an early example of private dialogue that continues to challenge and shape contemporary world affairs.

In undertaking a study of the intellectual community sustained by the Institute of Pacific Relations, this dissertation builds upon the work of international historian Akira Iriye, who has advocated greater exploration of international non-governmental organizations as a way to challenge a state-driven narrative of modern world history.[11] Iriye argues that international organizations do not necessarily conform to the imperatives of national interests, but address instead the problems of societies, groups and even individuals. As a reflection of increasing transnational interdependence, international organizations "may be said to be creating an alternative world, one that is not identical with the sum of sovereign states and nations."[12] Over its decades of existence, the Institute of Pacific Relations had a complex and even contradictory relationship with state power. As a confederation of national institutes, the IPR in some ways reinforced national identities and at times served to promote state interests through non-governmental means. Yet through the work of a strong international secretariat, and specifically its conference program, the IPR forged personal and institutional alliances that cut across state boundaries and created new allegiances that often competed with

[10] Ravenhill, *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism*, p. 42.
[11] Akira Iriye, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
[12] Iriye, *Global Community,* p. 7.

national identities. At times, this "imagined" world of an intellectual trans-Pacific community was strong enough to challenge the so-called "real world" of competing nation-states.[13]

The operation of this international intellectual community well into the late 1950s was in itself a fundamental challenge to the "real world" of the Cold War, which sought to reduce the complexity of international affairs into a simplistic battle between capitalism and communism. This dissertation does not minimize the importance of the Cold War, the Manichean politics of which undermined—and eventually destroyed—the Institute of Pacific Relations. Yet the scholarly preoccupation with the geopolitical conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union during these years has injected unwarranted cynicism into existing assessments of the work of internationalists in the 1930s and 1940s. With the passing of the Cold War, some historians are beginning to reassess the legacy of these internationalists and have noted that their multilateral vision for world affairs has since become embedded in the contemporary international system, whether in conceptions of national security, the rule of law, or human rights.[14] This dissertation extends this counter-narrative through the first two postwar decades. Rather than fold up their tent with the onset of the Cold War, Pacific internationalists continued to forge ahead with their projects, both as a rebuke both to their McCarthyist tormenters and the common conceit that the Pacific Ocean was an "American lake."

---

[13] Iriye posits the simultaneous existence of "two worlds" for the purposes of exploring the tensions between sovereign states and the project toward global community in "Internationalizing International History," in Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), pp. 47-62.

[14] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), pp. 250-284.

"THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MIND OF ASIA"

In pursuing a new conceptualization of the postwar period, this dissertation seeks to broaden our understanding of the Western "struggle for the mind of Asia" beyond the narrow calculus of the Cold War.[15] To be sure, the United States government in the late 1940s and 1950s was involved a multitude of propaganda efforts—both public and covert, using governmental and non-governmental means—to win over "hearts and minds" in "uncommitted" third-world nations.[16] Yet private contact to and within Asia persisted despite this constraining new imperative. Pacific internationalists involved with the Institute of Pacific Relations were certainly aware of this new American-led campaign, yet no archival evidence suggests that they were complicit in any way as a front organization for the CIA or other Western intelligence services. One explanation for this certainly must lie in the politically compromised position of the IPR by the early 1950s as a result of a U.S. Senate subcommittee investigation into alleged communist infiltration of the group before and during World War II. As importantly, however, the decentralized structure of the organization encouraged independence among the participating national councils. To win over Asian minds in this context, Western members needed to listen and learn, not simply preach.

By broadening the analysis of private East-West contact beyond the Cold War, this study brings into focus other major themes of the postwar years, especially the retreat of European imperialism and the rise of Asian nationalism. As Edward Carter's December 1946 letter indicates, one of the principal objects of Pacific internationalists

---

[15] The phrase is taken from Paul M.A. Linebarger, "The Struggle for the Mind of Asia," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 278 (Nov. 1951): 32-37.

[16] Laura Belmonte, *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006); Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The US Crusade Against the Soviet Union, 1945-56* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

was to help control and guide the "revolutionary forces" of Asia that were in the process of casting off centuries of colonialism. Carter was less concerned that revolutionary nationalism might take the form of communism than that it might turn against the West. Cold War historiography has tended to conflate these two dominant Western concerns, but they were distinct problems at the time. Among the principal functions of a group like the Institute of Pacific Relations, at least in Carter's mind, was to act as a private mediator between the peoples of Asia and the West as the postwar liberal international order was constructed. As IPR secretary-general, Carter played a major role in the development of an Asian regional sensibility among leaders in India and China, particularly during World War II. This Asian regionalism was not a threat to the West, so long as the IPR existed to provide a structured and controlled venue for it.

Given their success in forging pan-Pacific bridges, Pacific internationalists encountered a bitterly ironic stumbling block during the postwar years. The project of maintaining private links to Asia was a critical element in the broad "struggle for the mind of Asia," yet the strident anti-communism of Western policymakers stymied these very efforts at intellectual bridge-building. The establishment of the collective security group Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, for instance, was designed to create a "Free Asia" regionalism and ward off communist incursions, but it only managed to further polarize the region while failing to provide a credible system for collective defense.[17] The pressure to choose sides during the Cold War drove many Asian leaders toward "non-alignment," a trend that many Western officials viewed with alarm and dismay. Pacific internationalists, however, had a far more subtle understanding of such developments. They viewed with relative equanimity the first Asian-African conference held in Bandung, Indonesia in the spring of 1955, whereby the

---

[17] SEATO was eventually disbanded in 1977. Justus Maria Van der Kroef, *The Lives of SEATO* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1976).

leaders of newly independent countries proclaimed their desire to work together to oppose racism and colonialism around the world. The Bandung conference, in their view, was a challenge rather than a rebuke to the West, and exposed new realities regarding the relationship between Western nations and newly independent Asian countries. Through private channels, Asian intellectuals reassured Western counterparts that there was little chance of an anti-Western Afro-Asian "bloc," and recommitted themselves to building trans-Pacific relations and the larger international order.

Rather than assuming the Cold War to be the principal framework for analyzing the twentieth century, this project instead builds upon scholarship that has recast modern international history as an age of accelerating globalization. Revolutionary advances in communication, transportation, capital and technology, it has been argued, have created a greater sense of human interdependence and a sense of global consciousness—and thus require a new kind of global history.[18] Scholars continue to debate what "globalization" implies; its political, economic and cultural repercussions; its relationship to the nation-state; and whether it is a new phenomenon.[19] Without a doubt, Pacific internationalists in the early decades of the 20th century believed themselves to be in the midst of an exciting new age that allowed private elites to assume roles once reserved for state-sponsored diplomats. Writing in the March 1934 volume of *Pacific Affairs*, the Institute of Pacific Relations' house journal, newly installed editor Owen Lattimore described the Institute as an outgrowth of the need for "extra-national communication" between groups of concerned citizens, not just between national leaders. "It is an organ for promoting

---

[18] The literature on globalization is vast and growing. One early important work in separating the idea of global history from world history is Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens, eds., *Conceptualizing Global History* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993). For a more recent overview of the field, see Bruce Mazlish and Akira Iriye, eds., *The Global History Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

[19] On globalization's impact on national control over economic forces, see Susan Strange, *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996). On the attempt to periodize globalization into distinct historical ages, see A.G. Hopkins, ed., *Globalization in World History* (New York: Norton, 2002).

information and understanding," Lattimore continued, "not so much between nations as between groups or individuals within nations, and on a plane which is not exactly international, but which transcends the national and does not attempt the universal."[20] Because the Pacific area had been overlooked by Western powers, private elites had the chance to fashion their own vision of a regional community that could serve as a stepping-stone into Carter's hopeful postwar "gracious world society."

In more recent decades, globalization has been on the march, although few would argue that it has ushered in a more gracious world. Critics of globalization have noted that trade liberalization and freer capital flows have resulted in greater social inequality than ever before, and that the economic progress of so-called "developing" nations in many cases has all but stagnated.[21] Others claim that globalization is merely a mask for Western cultural imperialism, a stepping-stone not into a genuine global community but instead the "Americanization of the world."[22] It is reasonable to question, therefore, whether Pacific internationalists were themselves complicit in exacerbating these trends. With a largely American membership base, funding from Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, and corporate support from British and American companies, a group like the Institute of Pacific Relations naturally reflected Western, capitalist concerns. Pacific internationalists in Asia, moreover, usually consisted of English-speaking scholars or businessmen with significant experience in North America and Europe. With personal and professional ties to the West, such figures were not necessarily representative of the peoples they claimed to speak for at international gatherings.

---

[20] Editorial (unsigned), "Pacific Affairs," *Pacific Affairs,* Vol. 7, No. 1 (March 1934): 83-85.
[21] Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002).
[22] The phrase comes from W.T. Stead, *The Americanization of the World: Or the Trend of the Twentieth Century* (London: Horace Markley, 1902). For a critical survey of "cultural imperialism," see John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Ryan Dunch, "Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity," *History and Theory*, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Oct. 2002): 301-325.

A related criticism can be mounted against the Pacific internationalists' attempts to wed the West to Asia. In undertaking this larger struggle for Asian minds, did Western intellectuals exhibit a "Cold War orientalism" in their attitudes toward Asia?[23] Christina Klein has written that many American "middlebrow intellectuals" during these years eschewed prewar assertions of naked Western dominance in favor of a more "sentimental" framework that reflected tolerance and inclusion of Asian people. Through stories, plays and movies such as *The King and I* (1956), Klein writes that cultural producers "sought to replace the old nationalist map that Americans carried in their minds, in which the United States filled the frame, with a new internationalist one, in which the United States and 'free' Asia alike were embedded within a larger world system."[24] Many Pacific internationalists certainly used their research and conference programs to tout the potential of such a world system and the centrality of the United States within it. In this sense, one can argue they were complicit in helping to rationalize American involvement abroad, even as they rejected older forms of imperial behavior.[25]

Wielding the pejorative "imperialist" and "orientalist" cudgels, however, collapses the very real differences between the project of many Pacific internationalists and American state power during the Cold War years. For every defender of American foreign policy or Western business in Asia in the Institute of Pacific Relations, there was another to criticize their application. At the very least, the geographical diversity of Pacific internationalists made them less susceptible to forming a homogeneous world view dominated by the Cold War. In this respect they must be distinguished from other

[23] Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003). Klein distinguishes this idea from the better-known prewar variety analyzed in Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979).
[24] Klein, *Cold War Orientalism,* pp. 11-13.
[25] Klein cites Mary Louise Pratt's key concept of the "anti-conquest" narrative, defined by Pratt as "the strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they secure European hegemony." Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 7.

private groups dealing with international relations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the New York-based foreign-policy think tank that helped shape the contours of postwar American policy. One CFR historian has described the way in which the ideological war between the United States and the Soviet Union caused many council members to take a "myopic view" of international relations in the early Cold War, interpreting events solely through the lens of this confrontation.[26] CFR members, of course, were not institutionally compelled to contend with the perspectives of non-Americans. While some American IPR members undoubtedly shared a Cold War mindset, they were frequently challenged by others, particularly in Asia, who rejected Western policies motivated only by anti-communism. Overall, Pacific internationalists did not accept the parameters of Cold War politics as uncontested fact. As a result, they increasingly found themselves at odds not only with McCarthyist attackers, but also with top officials in the Western diplomatic community.

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Pacific internationalism found its expression from the 1920s through the 1950s through the private work of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Established in 1925 at a Honolulu conference originally organized by the international Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), the IPR developed a reputation during subsequent years as the organizer of several international conferences, and by World War II was widely praised as the "single best source" for information on the Pacific region.[27] Its articles, pamphlets

---

[26] Michael Wala, *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War* (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1994).

[27] Jacob Viner, a professor at Princeton University, provided the effusive praise during the war, comments which were later used in the Rockefeller Foundation's annual report in 1943. John H. Willits phone conversation with Viner, Sept. 18, 1950, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4198, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.

and books reached millions of students and servicemen, and its leaders moved fluidly in and out of government service. In the earliest years of the Cold War, however, anti-communist activists accused the IPR of promoting a communist line in its publications, and secretly supporting Mao Tse-tung's forces in China. In the wake of the "loss" of China to communism in 1949, Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin publicly reproached the American council, and Democratic Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada launched several months of U.S. Senate subcommittee hearings into the IPR's alleged violation of the Internal Security Act targeting subversive activities. Although largely cleared of charges that it infiltrated the State Department, the IPR's tarnished reputation in the United States grievously affected its membership and finances until its dissolution in 1961.

In using the Institute of Pacific Relations to understand the work of mid-century Pacific internationalists, this dissertation builds upon a growing body of literature concerning this early international non-governmental organization that seeks to reframe its significance beyond its notorious encounter with McCarthyism. This project does not attempt to serve as a comprehensive history of the IPR, a daunting task for any one scholar. With roughly a dozen national councils each engaged in independent programs of research and publications over a 36-year span, the Institute was a decentralized confederation of scholarly, business and diplomatic elites whose work varied tremendously from country to country and from year to year. Even within the American council, significant divisions often emerged between West Coast regional offices and the headquarters in New York City. In recent decades, however, scholars have undertaken projects that have illuminated different aspects of the Institute. The emerging portrait has revealed the IPR as an important precursor to modern day university-based Asian Studies programs and as locus of interwar internationalism. Yet current literature has neglected

the IPR's international projects after World War II, thus obscuring the ways in which its founding vision survived the trials of the Cold War and gained new relevance in the late 20th century.

The first major scholarly interest in the IPR was devoted to the accusations of communist infiltration into the organization made by Senators McCarthy and McCarran in the early 1950s. In his 1974 book *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics,* John N. Thomas criticized the McCarran subcommittee's investigation as shoddy and biased, and essentially cleared the Institute of the principal charges of being a communist front group to manipulate American policy in East Asia during the critical years leading up to the Chinese revolution in 1949.[28] But elsewhere in the book, Thomas landed blows against the IPR's leadership, especially longtime Secretary-General Edward Carter, for failing to adjust the group's programs to the new political landscape of the Cold War. The IPR's publication record dealing with the Soviet Union and Communist China, Thomas concluded, was "shallow and lacking in perception."[29] A failure to enunciate clear organizational goals and firm research guidelines, in his view, tripped the IPR into political controversy from which it could not recover. Thomas' work suggested that greater willingness to toe the anti-communist line could have saved the IPR from dissolution.

Thomas was interested in the Institute only inasmuch as it shed light into the McCarthy era in the United States, and coming on the heels of the IPR's downfall, his analysis did not explore the group's international impact or long-lasting scholarly influence. In the 1980s, these aspects of the IPR's work were first brought into view by Paul F. Hooper, a historian at the University of Hawaii. Hooper's 1980 book *Elusive*

---

[28] John N. Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974).
[29] Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations,* p. 163.

Destiny placed the Honolulu-founded IPR alongside other Hawaii-based internationalist projects of the modern era.[30] A subsequent article by Hooper demonstrated the way in which the Institute's conference and research program "laid the foundation" for contemporary Asian and Pacific area studies programs in the West.[31] In 1993, Hooper organized an international research conference at the University of Hawaii entitled "Rediscovering the IPR," a gathering that has since led to other conferences over the years, and whose collective work has established the internationalization of IPR scholarship.[32]

One of the major works to emerge from this reorientation was Tomoko Akami's *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Relations in Peace and War* (2001), which analyzed unofficial diplomatic contact between Japanese and American IPR members in the years preceding and during World War II.[33] Akami's work was the first broad survey of the Institute's early history, and outlined the way in which American-led regionalism dominated the IPR's early conception of a Pacific community, as well as the way these non-state experts used their expertise to garner influence on the world stage. Akami contended that by World War II, IPR experts were voluntarily co-opted into the service of governments. Their non-governmental status did not challenge the nation-state's authority but instead worked within its framework, she found. Akami further argued that the internationalist projects of the IPR were intimately

---

[30] Paul F. Hooper, *Elusive Destiny: The Internationalist Movement in Modern Hawaii* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980).
[31] Hooper, "The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Origins of Asian and Pacific Studies," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Spring 1988): 98-121.
[32] Hooper, ed., *Rediscovering the IPR: Proceedings of the First International Research Conference on the Institute of Pacific Relations: University of Hawaii, August 9-10, 1993* (Manoa, Hawaii: Center for Arts and Humanities, University of Hawaii, 1994); Michio Yamaoka and George M. Oshiro, eds., *Toward the Construction of a New Discipline: International Conference Proceedings on the Re-evaluation of the Institute of Pacific Relations* (Tokyo: Ronsosha, 2005).
[33] Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Relations in Peace and War* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

bound up in cultural and economic "Americanization," a process that appeared to be fulfilled with the rise of the Pax Americana at the conclusion of World War II.[34]

This dissertation both extends the story of the Pacific internationalists in the IPR into the postwar years and challenges assumptions of Akami and others about the relationship between these private experts and the nation-state, especially in the United States. From its beginning, the IPR represented a threat to traditional state diplomatic machinery. The independent actions of Secretary-General Edward Carter, in particular, often confounded American diplomats, who found the charismatic IPR leader at once a useful and maddening figure. State Department-IPR correspondence indicates that even during World War II, the close relationship between IPR leaders and state officials was also marked by wariness. More pronounced differences emerged in the postwar era, as many Pacific internationalists fought against the onset of a mentality defined purely by the Cold War. The inclusion of new Asian councils—especially India's—into the IPR's international structure further distinguished the group's agenda from that of Western governments. International conferences in the postwar era were notable for their critique of American Cold War policies, further straining the IPR's relationship with officials in Washington. Maintaining trans-Pacific intellectual ties in the postwar era, it became clear, could not be made compatible with an uncompromising Cold War agenda. The IPR began to lose public support in the United States, becoming vulnerable to the kind of political attacks that would eventually doom the organization.

The Institute of Pacific Relations may have succumbed to Cold War politics, but its vision of Pacific internationalism has survived. Other scholars such as Lawrence T. Woods have pointed to the IPR as a forerunner to contemporary efforts at Pacific non-

---

[34] Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific,* pp. 276-281. For more on this idea, see Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982).

governmental cooperation and so-called “track-two” informal diplomacy.[35] Yet none have undertaken a historical study of the IPR’s international postwar program to demonstrate the way in which Pacific internationalists carried the torch of their interwar vision into a new era, or kept alive the international ties that would later reconstitute themselves as regional associations. The perspective of history is critical in this regard. The IPR’s conceptualization of an Asia-Pacific region was not the only model for private dialogue, and challenges to it arose throughout this period. Many Asia experts in Great Britain, for instance, touted the Commonwealth of Nations as the ideal basis for East-West exchange in a bid to retain informal, post-imperial influence. Meanwhile, some Asian leaders promoted the idea of a more Asian-only regional grouping that would exclude Western members. In the several years following World War II, these visions intersected and collided as world conditions changed. The IPR provided the critical institutional structure that sustained dialogue regarding East-West relations during an age when global relations were warped by Cold War ideology. Although maligned at the time, their efforts should serve as a historical benchmark for contemporary non-governmental and inter-governmental efforts to bridge the Pacific divide.

In telling the story of mid-century Pacific internationalism, this dissertation makes use of archival materials that have not been mined in related studies. Whereas previous work on the IPR has largely focused on the voluminous holdings at Columbia University in New York, few researchers have taken advantage of the IPR fonds (collection) at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, which detail the Institute’s last decade in the wake of the McCarran hearings. Drawing from correspondence between the international secretariat and national councils, especially those in Asia, this dissertation

[35] Lawrence T. Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy: Nongovernmental Organizations and International Relations* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993).

recasts the IPR in the 1950s as a defiantly independent organization committed to carrying on an international research and conference agenda despite political troubles in the United States. This study also makes significant use of governmental archives in the United States, Great Britain and France to establish the ties between Western diplomatic officials and the IPR. These records reveal not only the complicated relationship between diplomats and their respective IPR councils, but also the fissures between Western nations in their approach to the struggle for Asian minds. The Rockefeller Archive Center in New York and the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library in Austin, Texas, meanwhile, provided significant new material to facilitate an improved understanding of post-IPR ventures like the Asia Society and the East-West Center, respectively. In combination, these materials provide scholars with a new portrait of postwar Pacific internationalism.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter One traces the origins and development of Pacific internationalism from the end of World War I through the outbreak of World War II, paying particular attention to the founding and operation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It argues that the IPR managed to gain influence within the corporate and diplomatic worlds, especially in the United States, by marketing itself as the primary source for objective information about the Asia-Pacific region. The organization also effectively billed itself as a private League of Nations, and its international conferences thus grew in stature. Early leaders of the IPR traded on their ability to move between official diplomacy and private activity in the academic and business worlds. The Institute's Secretary-General Edward Carter was particularly effective in winning over prominent financial supporters like John D. Rockefeller III to support the work of Carter's fellow Pacific internationalists. Carter's

relationship with diplomatic officials in the United States, however, was more complicated than other scholars have noted, this chapter suggests. Through his extensive travels in Asia, Carter offered unique insights into a region increasingly central to American strategic concerns, and thus was valuable to American diplomatic and military officials. Yet Carter's actions made clear that his primary duty was to the international program put forward by the IPR, and as a non-state actor he showed he was not necessarily beholden to U.S. official interests.

Chapter Two focuses on the wartime activities of the IPR. Institute leaders saw their opportunity to play a role in the debate over the postwar Pacific world, and commissioned numerous studies to outline these ideas. One of the critical components of a stable postwar world, most Pacific internationalists agreed, was an independent and thriving Asia-Pacific region with healthy partnerships between its major continental powers. As the private institute with the deepest ties to Asia, the IPR found itself uniquely positioned to encourage these trends. Edward Carter maximized his leverage with leaders around the world to engage in unofficial diplomacy, particularly between Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Chiang Kai-shek of China, helping to establish intra-Asian relationships that would have long-lasting effects on the continent. In a parallel effort, the IPR's role in helping establish the Indian Council of World Affairs encouraged an independent Indian view on international relations, distinct from that of the British Empire. Meanwhile, IPR writers traded on their unofficial influence to encourage democratic trends in Nationalist China, but their critique often earned the ire of their wartime allies and the consternation of American governmental officials.

The transition into the postwar world comprises the subject of Chapter Three. Pacific internationalists were forced to adapt to a global climate increasingly concerned with the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union, and marked in some

ways by resurgence in European imperial confidence. Although the United States may have been at the apex of its power in the Pacific, Europeans were able to dominate the direction of the Institute of Pacific Relations between the years 1945 and 1947, this chapter argues. By banding together through IPR contacts, the British, French and Dutch councils were able to marginalize anti-colonial criticism of their actions, a prominent feature at previous wartime conferences, and put the research institute on more "scientific" and less political footing. The forced retirement of the anti-colonial Edward Carter as secretary-general of the IPR was one of the prominent triumphs of this combined effort. By 1947, however, it became increasingly clear that Asian representation in the IPR was sorely lacking, and that an international research program could not function adequately without sufficient voices from the newly independent countries of Asia.

Chapter Four describes the IPR's efforts to establish private intellectual networks with Asian countries in the postwar period. The success of this project was mixed, this chapter suggests. On the one hand, the inclusion of India and Pakistan and the re-introduction of a Japanese council marked significant headway in the effort to bring in Asian perspectives into the private institute. On the other hand, the IPR found it difficult to translate the IPR model of a non-partisan and non-governmental research institute into countries where top regional experts were almost all working for the government, or seeking support from one political party or another. The fall of China to communism was another significant blow to the Institute's program. Not only did the IPR lose a national council from its ranks, but its work suddenly became highly politicized in the United States. As IPR conferences provided greater voice to Asian discontent with Western policies, moreover, some Americans began to question the desirability of funding such an international enterprise.

Chapter Five explains how Senator Joseph McCarthy's attack on Asian expert and IPR leader Owen Lattimore spilled over into a larger Senate investigation of the Institute itself, led by Senator Pat McCarran. During the course of the hearings, which lasted from 1951 into early 1952, political enemies of Pacific internationalists questioned not only the ideology of particular IPR members, but the very method of the Institute's work. The McCarran report condemned the Institute as a communist front organization that helped facilitate the "loss" of China in 1949, and as a result financial support for the Institute in the United States dried up. This chapter argues that by conflating the American IPR and the international IPR, senatorial inquisitors hurt their own purported cause of anti-communism. In undermining the American council, they threatened the very existence of the international structure of the IPR, which served as the best private contact point between elites in non-communist Asia and the West. Winning over Asian minds, in other words, became harder, not easier, as a result of the hearings.

Chapter Six examines the international reaction to the McCarran hearings, and places ongoing Asian affiliation with the IPR in the context of the "Bandung spirit" of the 1950s. While the Asian-African conference held in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955 brought out fears of an anti-Western bloc in many politicians, the continued operation of the international non-governmental intellectual network centered around the IPR made clear that Asian elites were nevertheless actively interested in maintaining links with the West. In fact, these intellectuals were convinced more than ever of the IPR's utility and independence as a result of its treatment during the McCarran hearings. This attachment to trans-Pacific dialogue was made abundantly clear when Chatham House Director-General Ivison Macadam floated a proposal to dissolve the IPR. The ensuing debate highlighted the commitment of Asian elites to the IPR. A better understanding of these

private links, this chapter argues, might have helped mitigate the Cold War paranoia of many Western policymakers during this time.

Chapter Seven traces how American political and philanthropic elites began to reassess East-West connections at the end of the 1950s. With the American IPR hemorrhaging support, Institute supporters sought to find a replacement organization to take part in international research and conference work with Asian elites. In the course of this search, however, IPR officials discovered that many American officials were more interested in selling American policies abroad than in hearing critical Asian voices. Governmental programs increasingly viewed non-governmental activity as useful only inasmuch as it could propagandize or engage in covert activity on behalf of U.S. interests. Rockefeller Foundation officials, meanwhile, created the Asia Society with much financial support and fanfare, but expressly shied away from political content and rejected the idea of taking over as the American council in the IPR. U.S. Senator Lyndon B. Johnson proposed the creation of the Hawaii-based East-West Center, which opened in 1960, all in the name of facilitating intellectual contact between the West and Asia, but its "bridge-building" potential was undermined through bureaucratic wrangling. By the time the IPR finally closed its doors for good in 1960, Institute officials were pessimistic about the ability to maintain private contact between Western and Asian elites.

The dissolution of the Institute of Pacific Relations masked broader successes in its regional vision, the Epilogue makes clear. Within a few years after the shuttering of the IPR, Japanese and Australian economists formerly associated with the group began collaborating on the creation of a Pacific free trade area, and later non-governmental contact resulted in the establishment of organizations such as the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (1980) and the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (1993). This non-governmental activity has been matched by more inter-governmental

ventures, most notably the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (1989). Yet challenges to Asia-Pacific partnerships are manifold, and it is by no means clear that such cooperative endeavors will persist. As politicians and academics alike begin to confront new challenges regarding larger economic and strategic relationships between “the West” and “the rest,” non-state actors are proving to be critical players in this debate. It is an apt time to be reminded of the promises and pitfalls of past private ventures into Pacific-wide collaboration.

Chapter One

The New Diplomacy in the Pacific, 1919-1937

In the years following World War I, a generation of Pacific internationalists coalesced around the project to reorder relations in the Pacific region and promote a more durable peace.[1] Eschewing traditional diplomacy, non-governmental elites in a number of countries sought to organize intellectuals into regional partnerships, bypassing official state machinery, with the ultimate goal of bringing about better transnational understanding. This collection of scholars, businessmen, journalists and philanthropists centered themselves around a new international private organization, the Institute of Pacific Relations, as a vehicle to collect data and organize research on the social and economic problems confronting the Pacific region. A series of international conferences convinced them of the beneficial results of such discussion, and earned the attention of prominent leaders in Europe, North America and Asia. Institute leaders formally disclaimed any ambitions to take on a diplomatic role for themselves even as they reconfigured the possibilities for private international contact.

Viewed in their immediate context, interwar Pacific internationalists were a decided failure: a second world war erupted, and anti-colonial nationalism flourished in Asia during subsequent years. The IPR itself, meanwhile, would soon fall victim to Cold War politics. Yet with a longer view of twentieth century history, one can argue that their vision had great resonance and international significance. Most critically, Institute leaders saw the importance of American leadership in fostering private, elite contact

---

[1] The most comprehensive study of Pacific internationalists during the interwar years can be found in Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific: The Institute of Pacific Relations in Peace and War* (New York: Routledge, 2002). Also see Paul F. Hooper, *Elusive Destiny: The Internationalist Movement in Modern Hawaii* (Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1980), pp. 79-125.

across the Pacific during an age in which the United States had eschewed membership in the League of Nations. These American leaders articulated a vision for the Pacific that attempted to refashion Western involvement with the region away from the outworn model of European colonialism. By constructing an edifice of cooperation and goodwill among private elites in the West and Asia during the interwar years, the American IPR as well as its fellow national councils were far better prepared to continue international efforts to bridge the Pacific in World War II and afterwards. These efforts were often obscured in the context of the polarization of the Cold War, but emerged ascendant once again in the latter part of the century. With this longer legacy in mind, the work of Pacific internationalists during the interwar period has shown remarkable durability.

THE NEW INTERNATIONALISTS

Even before the final shots were fired in the Great War, many international observers were convinced that the traditional practice of diplomacy that had undergirded the state system since 1815 was destined for the dustbin of history. The "old" diplomacy was associated with secret negotiations, trade rivalries and the arms race, all of which had contributed to the outbreak of the European war. The "new" diplomacy, on the other hand, promised to promote decision-making based on openness and public assent, an outlook sympathetic to the larger goals of disarmament, free trade and self-determination for peoples around the globe.[2] Not surprisingly, U.S. President Woodrow Wilson was the most prominent champion of this new approach, which saw a much greater role for Americans in international affairs. Although the failure of the United States to join the

[2] In hindsight, the differences between the "old" and "new" diplomacy have proved to be overstated, but the sense of dramatic departure from the past was nevertheless palpable at the time. See Sasson Sofer, "Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited," *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 14, No. 3 (July 1988): 195-211.

League of Nations dealt a blow to this vision, it was not destroyed in the 1920s. A new wave of internationalism promoted public interest in foreign affairs in the United States. International relations were deemed too important to leave in the hands of a few diplomats; instead, a wider group of informed citizens felt obligated to take up the work of keeping the peace.

Wilson's new diplomacy was visible in tangible ways at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 as a group of informal advisers, known simply as "the Inquiry," supplemented the American delegation's presence.[3] They relished their descent from the ivory tower into the thicket of practical problems at the conference tables of Versailles, whether in redrawing frontier lines in Europe or negotiating the postwar economic settlement. Fresh from this early success, Inquiry members determined to continue their work in the postwar period. The result was the founding of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), an independent foreign policy institute based in New York City. A similar group of British experts, meanwhile, established their own national group, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), acquiring grand London headquarters at Chatham House, the St. James's Square residence once owned by William Pitt. With their Paris experiences bolstering their credentials and confidence, CFR and RIIA members quickly overcame the skepticism of governmental and business leaders, and these institutes soon established themselves as indispensible clearinghouses for the latest debates over foreign policy ideas. The day of the scholar-expert clearly had arrived on the international scene.

---

[3] Col. Edward M. House, known as Wilson's "national security adviser," pushed the scholar-president to accept the idea of a collection of outside experts to help guide his ideas concerning postwar policy. Once approved, the young Harvard professor Walter Lippmann gathered together the group whose sole criterion for membership was, in his words, "sheer, startling genius." Peter Grose, *Continuing the Inquiry: The Council on Foreign Relations From 1921 to 1996* (New York: The Council on Foreign Relations, 1996), p. 1.

American and British members of these two foreign relations groups closely collaborated on research projects, especially in the first years of operation in the 1920s. They were decidedly Atlantic in orientation, concerned with maintaining healthy Anglo-American relations into the postwar years. In the United States, Council on Foreign Relations founders by and large were representatives of the so-called Eastern Establishment, from former secretary of state Elihu Root to younger thinkers like W. Averell Harriman and John Foster Dulles. Although they were outside of traditional state diplomatic machinery, CFR and RIIA members oriented their work toward the diplomatic community rather than the public at large. They valued confidential deliberation over public education; they only rarely opened up their conference proceedings to non-members. Lionel Curtis, one of the principal founders of Chatham House (as the RIIA increasingly became known), spoke for both British and American officers when he opined that public opinion should not be followed so much as guided by "a small number of people in real contact with the facts, who had thought out the issues involved."[4] They were serious, independent thinkers who were unabashedly elitist in their conception of their role as a non-partisan cauldron of ideas for professional diplomats.

The Council on Foreign Relations and Chatham House showcased the growing impact of non-state actors in the realm of foreign relations, but they were by no means the only offspring of citizen empowerment in the realm of international affairs stemming from World War I. In 1918, an American group that called itself the "Committee on Nothing at All" worked to build up support for President Wilson's League of Nations. Within months, it institutionalized itself as the Foreign Policy Association (FPA), a New York-based group dedicated to educating American citizens about international

[4] Grose, *Continuing the Inquiry*, pp. 9-14.

relations.[5] The FPA reflected a far more democratic vision than the CFR or Chatham House. The American public, in their view, should be informed and active participants in debating the principles and purposes of foreign policy. Within a few years, the Foreign Policy Association established itself in numerous cities around the United States as a stalwart of American adult education in the broad subject of world affairs.

Far from the Atlantic-centered cities of New York City and London, meanwhile, a different conception of internationalism began to take shape. The Hawaii-based journalist and civic booster Alexander Hume Ford was moved by the spirit of the times to foster greater international sentiment in the Pacific area. Ford had ventured to Hawaii as a young man early in the twentieth century and found a harmonious multi-racial society, a stark contrast to his childhood home of Charleston, South Carolina. Upon settling down in the islands, Ford concluded that Hawaii's peaceful racial cosmopolitanism could be marketed alongside its natural beauty in attracting tourists and business. Ford—"as much a Babbitt as a Wilson," according to historian Paul Hooper—created the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club in 1908 to promote international business development, as well as his own magazine, *Mid-Pacific*.[6] International trade was good business for Hawaii, Ford concluded, as well as for world peace. By World War I, Ford's singular vision had expanded into the creation of a more comprehensive organization, the Pan-Pacific Union, with plans for international conferences, a commercial museum and art gallery, and even an international college, all of whose programs were designed to bring the peoples of the Pacific Ocean into closer relations, with Hawaii as a linchpin.

In the midst of world war, Ford showed a remarkable degree of enthusiasm and an ability to woo important Hawaiian and other prominent supporters to the cause of Pacific

[5] There is little scholarship on the Foreign Policy Association apart from internal institutional histories. For an overview, see Donald Philips Dennis, *Foreign Policy in a Democracy: The Role of the Foreign Policy Association* (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 2002).
[6] Hooper, *Elusive Destiny,* pp. 65-104.

regionalism. Former Hawaii territorial governor Walter F. Frear agreed to serve as president of the Pan-Pacific Union; other officers included Hawaii notables such as Frank C. Atherton, William R. Castle and Syngman Rhee. Ford convinced the prime ministers of Australia and New Zealand, William M. Hughes and W.F. Massey, to serve as honorary presidents, and later included U.S. President Woodrow Wilson as well. Senator Warren G. Harding and Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane each had made separate trips to Hawaii, and upon meeting Ford, expressed great admiration of his endeavors. A trip to Washington, D.C. in late 1919 to promote the Pan-Pacific Union among legislators earned Ford perhaps his greatest coup, when he won over Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. According to Ford's later account, the arch-opponent of Wilson's League of Nations was far more sympathetic to Pacific internationalism. Lodge reportedly told Ford:

> I don't believe we can ever have a League of Nations composed of the countries around the Atlantic, for the traditions there have always been traditions of envy and hatred, thousands of years in Europe of war, envy and hatred. A world league of nations is a mad dream for the present, but out there in the Pacific, where you have never had a serious quarrel, your traditions are predominantly traditions of peace; there is the place to begin the work of a real League of Nations. You may do it there, and I am for such a League.[7]

Lodge's seemingly incongruous enthusiasm for Ford's internationalism made sense only in the context of a conception of the Pacific region as unsullied by European diplomatic failures. Even to a supposed isolationist like Lodge, the Pacific presented itself as an opportunity for new international partnerships that the United States should support.

Ford's Pan-Pacific Union succeeded in hosting a number of small conferences on scientific and educational concerns in Hawaii in the early 1920s, but it ultimately failed at

---

[7] Ford account quoted in Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, pp. 84-85.   As Hooper notes, Ford's account of his conversation with Lodge certainly could have been embellished, but the fact that the Union did receive the money and Lodge later sent an autographed photograph for publication in the Union periodical *Mid-Pacific Magazine* gives credence to the senator's support.

becoming a Pan-Pacific League of Nations, or even the Pacific equivalent of the Pan-American Union, Ford's original goal. For all of the encomia and grand rhetoric, the Union itself remained essentially a booster club for Hawaii businesses. The activities of the Union increasingly centered around Honolulu, and indeed around Ford himself, despite his best intentions to cultivate broader Union leadership and an international presence.[8] The Pan-Pacific Union may not have been the vehicle, but Ford's vision of Pacific internationalism clearly had resonance. His conceptualization of the Pacific region as a single entity was a major contribution that led in no small measure to the 1925 founding of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which would comprise the heart of the Pacific internationalist movement for the following three decades. The IPR, with ties to financial and political elites in the mainland United States as well as among scholars and businessmen in Europe and Asia, would transform Pacific internationalism from a provincial Hawaiian concern into a matter of global importance in the coming years.

ESTABLISHING THE IPR

A combination of missionary-inspired activism, scholarly ideas and philanthropic interest resulted in the founding of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1925. As early as 1919, the American Young Men's Christian Association began making plans to hold a leadership conference in Honolulu on the "fundamental" elements of Christianity and their application to the peoples of the Pacific in order to help the YMCA's work in the region. The YMCA had a long-standing presence in the Pacific, with chapters in the

[8] By the 1930s Ford's writings increasingly focused upon defending Japan against American critics, positions that resulted in earning him derision from the mainland and dwindling governmental and private support for Union projects. The Pan-Pacific Union's publications and conference program withered away as the great depression sapped its resources until its eventual collapse in 1939. Ford, meanwhile, increasingly sick and tired, slipped out of the public eye for the last several years of his life until his death, obscure and penniless, in 1945. Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, pp. 100-104.

Philippines, Korea, Japan and China, and a reputation for work in social development and racial justice. The American YMCA turned to one of their prominent national leaders, Frank C. Atherton, to help organize the proposed gathering. Atherton was a natural fit for the job. His father, Joseph Ballard Atherton, ran Castle and Cook, one of Hawaii's oldest business firms and played a key role in the founding of the Hawaii YMCA in 1869. Frank Atherton followed in his father's footsteps at Castle and Cook as well as the Hawaii YMCA, becoming one of Hawaii's best-known businessmen and philanthropists by the end of World War I. Atherton may not have had the personal flair of Alexander Ford, but he was far more practical, and he earned a reputation as a man of personal integrity and organizational ability. As a member of the national YMCA committee in charge of its international program, Atherton supported the idea of a YMCA meeting in Honolulu, but by 1923 he expressed a belief that such a conference might go beyond the training of Y officials and instead consider problems of the Pacific more broadly.[9]

International YMCA officials quickly agreed to a more ambitious program for the Hawaii meeting, notably at the second World's Conference of YMCA Workers Among Boys in Portschach, Austria, in May 1923. In a December 7, 1923 letter to national committees of the YMCA in Australia, Canada, China, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines and the United States, Atherton and Charles Loomis, the co-chairs of the Honolulu conference committee, proposed holding a conference in 1925 "to consider some of the problems of the Pacific peoples from a Christian viewpoint and to formulate some practical constructive plans that will help in their solution."[10] Even as the YMCA used its machinery to contact members in these Pacific countries, the central purpose of the conference had begun to shift beyond a purely internal matter toward larger regional

---

[9] For more on Frank Atherton, see Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, pp. 105-117.

[10] Institute of Pacific Relations, *Honolulu Session: June 30—July 14, 1925: History, Organization, Proceedings, Discussions and Addresses* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), pp. 10-11.

questions, as Atherton and others now recognized. YMCA officials now decided to bring in outside experts to advise them on the proposed program, including Raymond Fosdick, former undersecretary general of the League of Nations (1919-20) as well as trustee (1921-36) and later president (1936-48) of the Rockefeller Foundation. Fosdick showed enthusiasm about the idea of applying Christian principles to world problems, but was less certain that such a project would receive financial help if it were run as a purely YMCA activity.[11]

Another prominent adviser, Stanford University President Ray Lyman Wilbur, also urged the planning committee to separate the Honolulu conference from the YMCA. Wilbur had been brought to the attention of conference organizers as a result of his two-year study on Asian immigrants' integration into American society and subsequent 1924 article, "Survey of Race Relations: A Study of the Oriental on the Pacific Coast." Published in the context of severe Asian immigration restrictions as a result of the 1924 Immigration Act, Wilbur and his survey team found that Japanese and Chinese immigrants were not a threat to economic life on the West Coast, but instead were a driving force behind the region's growth. Moreover, Wilbur showed that these immigrants had revealed a "remarkable" degree of assimilation into American culture, despite the prejudice and blatant discrimination they faced.[12] It was this sort of project—rigorous and objective, yet rooted in human experience—that appealed to the conference organizers as a model for their own proposed work. Furthermore, Wilbur's presence as a respected educator added considerable prestige to the Honolulu project. Once assured of the prospective conference's independence from religious concerns, Wilbur agreed to serve as the head of a New York-based organizing committee.[13]

---

[11] Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, pp. 46-58.
[12] Ray Lyman Wilbur, *Memoirs* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1960), pp. 315-318.
[13] Wilbur, *Memoirs,* p. 317.

With the involvement of officials at the Rockefeller Foundation and Stanford University, the Honolulu conference now took on a life of its own, and passed—graciously and willingly, by all accounts—out of the hands of the YMCA and the Honolulu group's original organizing committee, and into the hands of Wilbur and other mainland establishment figures.[14] At the suggestion of Roland S. Morris, the former American ambassador to Japan, Wilbur and his New York committee invited 41 people with experience in international and Pacific affairs to gather at New York City's Yale Club on February 22, 1925 for further planning. The group represented an even mix of academics, journalists, publishers, businessmen, officials in non-profit foundations as well as YMCA members. Prominent among them included Stanley K. Hornbeck, the Harvard lecturer and later State Department official specializing in China; James T. Shotwell, the Columbia University international law expert and former "Inquiry" member; Archibald Coolidge, the editor of the Council on Foreign Relations' journal *Foreign Affairs*; and Charles Batchelder, former commissioner for the Far Eastern Trade Bureau. The Yale Club gathering not only endorsed the idea of a broad Honolulu conference, but also gave shape to the agenda. The proposed Hawaii gathering, they concluded, should stress common interests around the Pacific, be informative rather than argumentative, and not interfere with traditional diplomatic machinery. Not least, the group determined that participants at the conference should consider forming a

[14] A September 1924 meeting in Atlantic City agreed that the Hawaii conference would still employ a "Christian approach" but that membership would not be limited to Christians or YMCA members. The Central Executive Committee in Hawaii, meanwhile, made changes in the plans for the conference to separate itself entirely from the YMCA. "When, finally, it appeared that the plans had outgrown the normal scope of the Young Men's Christian Association, it dropped the control and without protest or criticism allowed the Institute [of Pacific Relations] to become a self-governing body. Any idea of Christian propaganda, which was somewhat prominent in the earlier stages of the evolution of the Institute, was wholly dropped." Institute of Pacific Relations, *Honolulu Session,* pp. 23-24.

permanent, international, non-governmental organization to carry on regional research and educational work: an Institute of Pacific Relations.[15]

During the course of the first week in July, 140 participants from around the Pacific region gathered in Honolulu at the Punahou School for what would become the first international conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. A plurality (39) came from the mainland United States, while Hawaiians formed an independent delegation of 29 members and associates. Japanese (20), Chinese (14) and Korean (8) delegates represented Asia, while the Pacific British Dominions were represented by Australia (6), Canada (7) and New Zealand (11). Three Filipinos, as well as a handful of observers from the YMCA in England and Switzerland, rounded out the international gathering. YMCA members were a significant portion of the conference, but by no means dominated the proceedings. A motley crew of scholars, journalists and businessmen, from a Japanese steamship company owner to the former Chinese commissioner of foreign affairs, met over morning meditation sessions, mingled in the hallways and stayed in dorms as if they were students at an international summer school. "It was an intensely human experience," Ray Lyman Wilbur recalled of the time he spent there. "Men and women of conflicting interests and different backgrounds, with various social, economic, and political concepts of life—of different races and nine nationalities—lived and studied together to see if a new type of international community could be created in the Pacific area built upon reciprocity and mutual understanding."[16] Later conference participants would use similar language to describe their experiences at such gatherings. In this environment, ideas were debated, but just as importantly, relationships were formed that in many cases lasted decades.

---

[15] Institute of Pacific Relations, *Honolulu Session,* pp. 19-22.
[16] Wilbur, *Memoirs*, p. 324.

From its very first days, the founders of the Institute of Pacific Relations confronted the problem of creating an independent actor on the international stage that would not conflict with official state machinery. It was a delicate proposal that quickly caused headaches within the diplomatic community, especially in Washington. An Institute subcommittee on the purpose and scope of the IPR on the eve of the Hawaii conference determined that the Institute should be devoted to collecting and elucidating the facts concerning the educational, social, political and even moral conditions of Pacific region, with a view to "removal of difficulties in international relations." Words such as these sent off alarms in those officials who were concerned that such conferences might focus on such "difficulties," especially the extremely sensitive issue of Japanese immigration policy. The last thing American government officials wanted was a public forum for the airing of anti-American grievances. State Department officials urged Institute leaders to restrict their agenda and publicity, and made it clear that the IPR would receive no official blessing from the U.S. government.[17]

Institute leaders were sensitive to these charges and sought to rebut the worries of diplomats, even as they insisted that they would not shy away from controversial topics. They did this by emphasizing that their international gatherings would be composed of representative national *groups*, not official national delegations. In one of the opening addresses to the 1925 Honolulu gathering, Arthur L. Dean, the president of the University of Hawaii, flatly stated, "The business of this Institute is not diplomacy." Conference participants were not present to seek advantages for their home country's official position, he continued, but rather to listen and learn: "We are here as individuals looking

---

[17] The primary contact between Institute founders and the State Department was John A. MacMurray, assistant secretary of state, who requested that he be kept apprised of all developments regarding the Honolulu conference. J. Merle Davis to MacMurray, March 4, 1925; MacMurray to Davis, March 6, 1925, in Record Group 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations, National Archives and Records Association (NARA), College Park, MD.

for the light, seeking to gain wisdom, and, in all humbleness of mind hoping that through us wisdom may in some measure grow among the peoples from whom we come."[18] While Dean's remarks betrayed some defensiveness about this incipient international project, he also displayed his Progressive-era faith in the power of reasonable debate among elite, informed actors to reach mutually beneficial consensus. Such comments also reflected the optimism of the mid-1920s that rational discussion really could prevent future conflict.

Conference organizers emphasized matters of common interest, but the challenge of reconciling vastly different national perspectives was made clear as early as the opening statements from the leaders of each country's delegation. China's T.K. Zoo, secretary of the World Christian Student Federation in Geneva, did not mince words when he described the problems of the Pacific as essentially a deep division between West and East, separated by the dynamics of race and power:

> On the one hand we find a group of nations, mainly of the white race, which through one means or another, have in the past years secured certain privileges, rights and territories from eastern peoples. These they are very anxious to maintain and keep as long as possible. On the other hand, we find another group of nations in which the spirit of nationalism and racial consciousness is rapidly growing and which are therefore anxious to recover what has been wrested from them in the past. … Left to itself, the situation will inevitably lead to conflict and disaster …[I]t is because we have all recognized the futility and horror of letting the situation drift to its inevitable end that we have come together to find another way out.[19]

Americans did not like to think of themselves as sullied by this colonial tradition, as conference participants made clear. Ray Lyman Wilbur, as head of the American group, put forward a picture of the United States that had largely stumbled into its Pacific interests and had no further territorial ambition. Wilbur stressed the "peculiar idealism

[18] Arthur L. Dean, "The Approach to Pacific Problems," *Honolulu Session,* pp. 46-52.
[19] Institute of Pacific Relations, *Honolulu Session,* pp. 68-70.

and the pioneer spirit" of the American people, and their dedication to the sense of "fair play." Finally, he sought to downplay the impact of the recent decision to sharply limit Asian immigration into the United States by saying that it resulted from an inability of the American people to understand the larger problems of immigration. Despite these setbacks in diplomacy, Wilbur reassured his audience that the United States exhibited "goodwill towards all countries of the Pacific," and the country was determined not to repeat the mistakes of the past.[20]

The mixture of frank talk with an atmosphere of civilized congeniality proved to be a winning recipe for the 1925 Honolulu conference attendees, and positive press quickly followed. One participant, Paul Scharrenberg, the secretary and treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor, declared that the Japanese exclusion provisions in the 1924 Immigration Act would not have been passed had the Honolulu conference been held two years earlier. A Tokyo editor, meanwhile, reported that anti-American editorials had sharply decreased since the Japanese delegates returned from Honolulu.[21] These kinds of anecdotes resonated with foundation officers and brought stable financial support. Notably, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund appropriated $10,000 for 1926 and 1927, an amount that increased to $15,000 annually for the rest of the decade, and marked the beginning of a long-standing commitment to the group.[22] The success of the 1925 conference also allowed members to establish a permanent institute with autonomous national councils, an international secretariat's office located in Honolulu run by former YMCA official J. Merle Davis, and the creation of a governing body, the Pacific Council, consisting of one representative from each of the participating

---

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-98.
[21] J. Merle Davis to Robert E. Olds, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Nov. 30, 1926, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations, NARA.
[22] Rockefeller Foundation grant files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 350, Folder 4171, RAC.

national councils. The Institute launched an ambitious research program and began publishing a newsletter, *Pacific Affairs*, which in a few years' time grew into a quarterly publication.

By the time the Institute of Pacific Relations gathered for its second conference in Honolulu in the summer of 1927, it had gained a considerable reputation as an international research and education organization. The IPR also had generally overcome the suspicions of American governmental officials who worried about scholarly amateurs intruding into the hallowed ground of high diplomacy. William R. Castle, Jr., the Hawaii-born State Department chief of Western European affairs, wrote longtime White House aide Rudolph Forster that the Institute's first meeting had produced only good will, and that President Calvin Coolidge should be made aware that conference organizers were "very careful to keep close to facts and to avoid criticism of this Government or of any other government."[23] Coolidge sent a welcome message to the 1927 conference, a practice that later presidents followed. White House and State Department officials agreed to keep their hands off this new Institute once reassured that the international organization did not seek to undermine or replace American diplomatic efforts in the region.

In the early years of the Institute, its leaders reaffirmed the IPR's status as an unofficial organization: non-governmental, non-sectarian, non-partisan and non-propagandist. The IPR was barred in its constitution from passing resolutions or advocating any policy decisions. The object of the Institute was simply "to study the conditions of the Pacific peoples with a view to the improvement of their mutual relations."[24] Their contribution to international relations was made instead through

---

[23] W.R. Castle, Jr. to Rudolph Forster, July 12, 1927, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations, NARA.

[24] Appendix III, Constitution of the Institute of Pacific Relations, in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1927* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 607-610.

research projects and the publication of books, articles and pamphlets regarding matters of regional contemporary concern. This alone could make a difference to the conduct of international relations, they believed, especially in the context of the League of Nations' approach to resolving disputes. At a 1927 Institute roundtable discussion on "the new diplomacy," conference participants agreed that modern democratic institutions, universal education and improved communication had vastly undermined the potential for "hole-and-corner" secret diplomacy of the past, and instead promoted the more open conference approach to international problems.[25]

Most IPR members agreed that the League of Nations' method of discussion had made tremendous strides in achieving greater public awareness of international deliberations, but they also recognized that the League had inherent disadvantages in adjudicating problems in the Pacific. First, the Soviet Union and the United States were not members of the League, which severely limited its claims for full representation. A second drawback was that many in China and Japan were distrustful of the League's Europe-centeredness, viewing it as another white man's club. Some in the IPR believed that they should involve themselves in fashioning new diplomatic machinery for the Pacific area, but the idea was quashed: the Institute, its leaders insisted, was not an action organization and should keep its research "scientific" in conception in execution.[26]

Even as Institute leaders rushed to disclaim aspirations to set up alternative diplomacy in the Pacific region, their international conferences in many ways had radical and far-reaching implications. Rather than assuming delegates had fixed national perspectives, IPR organizers believed that intensive, multi-day sessions could lead to

---

[25] Roundtable discussion, "The New Diplomacy," in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1927*, pp. 162-164.
[26] Roundtable discussion, "Diplomatic Relations in the Pacific," in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1929: Proceedings of the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Nara and Kyoto, Japan, October 23 to November 9, 1929* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), pp. 211-244.

greater empathy between them, and perhaps result in a modification of views. Stanford's Ray Lyman Wilbur expressed this hope in the IPR method during a 1927 commencement speech: "To see yourself as others see you, to view your own country through the questioning eyes of foreign neighbors, is a chastening and wholesome experience and one that millions must undergo if we are to deal successfully across the great ocean."[27] To this end, roundtable discussions at IPR conferences were held in private session, out of public view. Reporters were briefed at the end of such sessions regarding the summary of discussions, so that delegate anonymity could be preserved. Off-the-record conversations were more likely to express frank and contrary viewpoints, but they also allowed participants to change their opinions from the beginning to the end of conferences. Delegates were expected to return home with a wider perspective and a greater understanding for those with whom they disagreed.[28]

EVOLVING CONCEPTIONS OF THE PACIFIC

In the Pan-Pacific Union, Alexander Ford had promoted the notion of a Pacific family in contrast to the fractiousness and failed relationships of the old world. This notion of entering into a new Pacific-only partnership excited many Americans like Senator Henry Cabot Lodge who otherwise opposed the United States entering entangling international alliances, especially with Europe. Some original IPR founders shared this enthusiasm. "If the Institute of Pacific Relations can further this sense of solidarity in the Pacific community," General Secretary J. Merle Davis wrote in 1929, "it

---

[27] Quoted in Carl Spaeth, "The Lucknow Conference: India and the US" [lecture], December 1950, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 358, Folder 4249, RAC.

[28] This view of the purpose behind IPR conferences was expressed by longtime Secretary-General Edward Carter, "A Personal View of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1925-1952," in Box 11, Folder 18, Edward C. Carter Papers, University of Vermont archives (UVM), Burlington.

will justify its actions."[29] But after the first few years of operation, IPR leaders began to take stock of their purpose, and gradually stepped back from the grand idea of creating an exclusive Pacific community of nations. Instead they began to temper their idealism with a more "realistic" in their approach to regional problems.[30] Many leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations now concluded that Pacific questions were not unique, but inevitably tied into larger world questions. The problems of the Pacific, in this view, were the products of commercial and cultural contact between Western and Eastern civilizations. European nations, accordingly, should therefore be active participants in the Institute's work. As the 1930s wore in, the IPR worked to provide a forum for an open airing of differences among nations interested in the Pacific rather than a false front of uniformity by an invoked "community."

European colonial powers were not considered "Pacific" nations at the original Hawaii gathering in 1925, but participants quickly realized that they could not be ignored in a full discussion of regional matters. Delegates from Australia, New Zealand and Canada—the so-called "Pacific Dominions"—protested at the lack of participation from Great Britain. World War I may have spurred greater independence in foreign affairs for the Dominions, but as members of the incipient British Commonwealth of Nations, they also felt constrained in expressing views on international relations without the presence of British delegates.[31] As a result of this protest, Institute leaders invited Chatham House to organize a Pacific Relations committee, which in turn assembled a delegation to the 1927 conference and which would go on to serve as the British national council for

---

[29] Davis, preface to J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1929*, p. xi.

[30] One of the best statements of this evolution in thought came from Jerome D. Greene, the chairman of the IPR's Pacific Council, in a letter to Ivison Macadam, the director of Chatham House. Greene to Macadam, Dec. 28, 1931, in CHA 6/1/2, Royal Institute of International Affairs, (RIIA), London.

[31] J.B. Condliffe (New Zealand delegate) in Institute of Pacific Relations, *First Conference, Honolulu, 1925* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), pp. 87-93; also see Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific,* p. 100.

the remainder of the IPR's existence. Other European powers soon followed. In the 1930s, councils in France and the Netherlands were established to participate in the Institute's research and conference program. As IPR chronicler Tomoko Akami has noted, while many early leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations had grand visions for a new democratic regional order, they also acknowledged the overriding reality that the Asia-Pacific region was still dominated by the colonial powers, and must be included in any projects debating its future.[32]

The presence of Chatham House in the Institute of Pacific Relations—and specifically, the participation of leading member Lionel Curtis—provided a significantly new conception of potential Pacific relationships after 1927. Curtis' vision for the Pacific was one of continued British imperial control, with the active support of the British Dominions as well as United States, rather than a specifically regional union. Having served under Lord (Alfred) Milner, High Commissioner of South Africa, as a young man during the South African union in 1910, Curtis went on to dedicate his life to the principle of imperial unity—that is, the assumption of British imperial burdens by the settler colonies themselves—and was often credited as being the "prophet" of the Commonwealth idea through the establishment of Round Table debating societies in the Dominions.[33] Curtis became one of the principal founders of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) in London in 1920, and fostered the development of similar institutes of international affairs in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. With the creation of the Institute of Pacific Relations a few years later, Curtis saw an opportunity to fuse the regional interests of Britain and the Pacific Dominions, as well as

[32] Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 12.

[33] The best overview of the Round Table movement is by John Kendle, *The Round Table Movement and Imperial Union* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1975). For more on Lionel Curtis, see Deborah Lavin, *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

to coordinate American and British thinking on Pacific questions. Indeed, it was Curtis' ultimate hopes for a shared Anglo-American approach toward world affairs that animated British involvement in the Institute of Pacific Relations.

The suspicion of collusion between Great Britain and the United States was a matter of great sensitivity to Asians, and IPR leaders worked hard to dispel the notion that the Institute was merely a tool of Western "imperialism," a charge leveled at various times in the Chinese nationalist press.[34] On its surface, the criticism was unjust: American delegates disagreed with British members over matters of colonial policy with increasing vigor in the following years, despite the best efforts of Curtis and Chatham House to win them over to a "democratic imperialist" mindset. American leadership overwhelmingly defined the Institute's international program for its first two decades, a situation that often agitated the denizens of Chatham House and reinforced divisions in the Western view toward Asia. But on another level, critics of Western bias in the IPR had a point. American money and personnel were the indisputable engines driving the Institute. The conference proceedings, moreover, were conducted entirely in English, a fact that put Asian members at a disadvantage in roundtable discussions. "I think all the members from my country would agree with me in saying that we might have been able to participate more intelligently and intelligibly were it not for the difficulties in the language," a Japanese delegate complained in 1927. "What is more important, we might have secured for members of our group perhaps better and stronger men had it not been for the same difficulty."[35] In ways large and small, the IPR's early years reflected its

---

[34] On the eve of the 1931 conference in China, for instance newspapers in Hangchow and Nanking ran editorials condemning the IPR as a mere mouthpiece of the Western powers. Jerome D. Greene to Stanley K. Hornbeck, Aug. 14, 1931, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/33, NARA.

[35] The [unnamed] Japanese delegate was likely the chairman of the group, Masataro Sawayanagi, member of the House of Peers and president of the Imperial Association. His fellow delegates were almost universally professors of political science and economics, with very little business interests represented.

Western origins, even if its European and American members were not always in accord with one another.

Despite the built-in Western predominance in IPR funding and membership, Chinese and Japanese delegates largely supported the design and operation of the Institute's work. At a 1927 roundtable discussion concerning the future of the IPR, one American delegate argued on behalf of cutting the size of the American delegation by half. A Chinese member, however, declined to object, noting that more Americans were interested in Pacific affairs than other countries.[36] Institute leaders decided to hold the next two international conferences in Japan (1929) and China (1931) to boost publicity and interest in the organization in those countries, a strategy that largely succeeded. One Japanese participant in the 1927 IPR conference attributed growing Asian support for the Institute to the fact that the group had "nothing to sell, nothing to teach and nothing to preach—in short, nothing to put over on the Far East."[37] Westerners may have dominated the leadership of the organization, but they at least appeared genuinely interested in listening to alternative viewpoints rather than simply defending their own country's policies.

One of the greatest impediments to creating a sense of solidarity among the peoples of the Pacific was not the division between West and East, as China's T.K. Zoo had implied in 1925, but rather between Japan and China. This division became dramatically apparent during the Manchurian crisis in the fall of 1931. For many years China had claimed legal control over the northeastern province, but Japan exercised considerable trading privileges in the region, including leasing rights over the South

---

Roundtable discussion, "The New Diplomacy," in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1927*, p. 166.

[36] Roundtable discussion, "Future of the Institute," in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1927,* pp. 196-217.

[37] Anonymous "Japanese leader" quotation in Merle Davis, preface, in J.B. Condliffe, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1929*, p. vi.

Manchurian Railway. Tension over local authority escalated in the late 1920s, and boiled over on September 18, 1931, when a section of railroad track was dynamited near Mukden in an act of sabotage later attributed to Japanese military officers. The explosion provided a pretext for the Japanese imperial army to invade Manchuria and occupy its principal cities. The Manchurian crisis, as it became known, not only provided the greatest test for the League of Nations to that point, but also for Pacific internationalism associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations. The Institute already had made plans for its biennial conference to take place in Hangchow, China in late October 1931, but anti-Japanese sentiment was running so high at that time that Institute leaders considered abandoning the meeting altogether. At a meeting a mere one month after the Mukden incident, the Pacific Council, the governing body of the Institute, determined that the IPR could go forward with the conference, but they recommended moving the proceedings to the international settlement in Shanghai and reducing somewhat the overall delegate numbers. It was a remarkable moment, then, when inside Shanghai's International Recreation Club on October 21, 1931, Dr. Hu Shih, the president of the conference, China's leading public intellectual and future ambassador to the United States, announced: "This *is* the Fourth Biennial Conference."[38]

During the course of the next 12 days, Chinese and Japanese members sat alongside other national delegates in roundtable discussions dealing with issues from trade relations to the more sensitive subject of diplomacy in the Pacific region. Emotions were raw, few facts concerning the Mukden incident were established, and the League of Nations' response was still uncertain. The Chinese government had submitted a formal appeal to the League for the apparent Japanese act of aggression, a move that many

---

[38] Bruno Lasker, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1931: Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow and Shanghai, China, October 21 to November 2* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), p. v.

Japanese delegates claimed would only hamper direct talks between the two countries. At times the discussion became so heated that several Japanese withdrew from the conference and refused to participate until they had received apologies from Chinese members. But these moments were the exceptions rather than the rule. Disagreements at the conference were resolved amicably and did not spill over into public demonstrations outside the conference, as many feared might happen. Given the circumstances, observers were struck by the remarkable degree of cordiality shown by all participants.[39] The fact the conference took place at all was a signal triumph for the Institute's agenda and methods, Hu Shih remarked to the assembled delegates:

> It is not saying too much that … this conference will long be remembered, not only in the annals of our own Institute, but also in the history of all sister institutions of an international nature, as having set up a splendid precedent that all those who in peaceful times pride themselves as being internationally-minded must not desert the ideal of calm thinking, patient research and open-minded discussion at a time when folly reigns and passions carry the day.[40]

IPR leaders left the conference with a sense of vindication for its purpose, and with an enhanced international reputation for its willingness to confront and illuminate difficult regional problems in an evenhanded manner.

The Manchurian crisis deepened the resolve among Pacific internationalists to seek extra-diplomatic forms of resolving disputes. IPR members agreed that prompt international action at the time of the initial Mukden incident might have prevented an escalation of the situation, yet none was forthcoming. No disinterested friends of China and Japan were prepared to step forward and institute a process for inquiry and reconciliation. Instead, Japan became increasingly disillusioned with the League of Nations and finally withdrew its membership in March 1933. Yet the Institute of Pacific

---

[39] Edwin S. Cunningham, American Consul General, Shanghai, to the U.S. Secretary of State, Nov. 17, 1931, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/36, NARA.

[40] Hu Shih, opening statement, in Bruno Lasker, ed., *Problems of the Pacific, 1931*, p. vi.

Relations continued to boast Japanese and Chinese members throughout the decade, even as war clouds gathered over the two countries. As the 1930s wore on, the IPR found itself as one of the increasingly few avenues for airing the ambitions and interests of the Chinese and Japanese people side by side, not simply their stated governmental policies. As an unofficial body, furthermore, participants at conferences could advance a broader array of suggestions for resolving these underlying conflicts than official figures might. Although Institute members had rejected the "diplomatic" label only a few years before, the deepening crisis in the Pacific embroiled the group ever more in political questions and forced them to consider how they might act to help prevent future disputes. The League of Nations had failed its first great test, but the Manchurian crisis had the interesting effect of elevating the profile of Pacific internationalism.

EDWARD CARTER'S INSTITUTE

Regional events may have catapulted the Institute of Pacific Relations to greater prominence in the 1930s, but its more political turn was also the product of new leadership—specifically, the Institute's ambitious new secretary-general, Edward C. Carter. During his time at the helm of the IPR's international secretariat (1933-1946), Carter directed the Institute's programs with an unrelenting vision to transform the IPR into a body with real policy relevance. Described as a "veritable whirlwind of activity" by his research associate and later successor, William L. Holland, Carter was more of an organizer than an academic, and he had a gift for promoting the Institute through the cultivation of numerous contacts in the philanthropic, business and diplomatic worlds in several countries.[41] A handsome man with a large head featuring a shock of white hair

---

41 Paul F. Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations: The Memoirs of William L. Holland* (Tokyo: Ryukei shosha, 1995), p. 77.

and thick eyebrows, Carter was no shrinking violet. Although his job as secretary-general was designed specifically to help coordinate the activities of the various national councils, Carter concentrated ever more power within the international office, which eventually shifted its headquarters from Honolulu to New York City, next door to the American council's headquarters. Many in Hawaii and the U.S. West Coast were suspicious of Carter's actions as favoring an East Coast perspective over their Pacific-centered community-building mission. They were not his only critics. In subsequent years, Carter's unrelenting anti-colonialism would provoke anger and resentment by the European councils. His force of personality, however, combined with his expert fundraising skills and familiarity with world leaders made Carter an indispensable figure during the Institute's most active years. "I do not think it overemotional to suggest that the IPR was in so many ways his creation and therefore should be regarded as his monument," Holland concluded many years later.[42] Through his extensive international contacts, Carter demonstrated the ability to act as a roving ambassador for the cause of Pacific internationalism.

Born in Massachusetts in 1878, Carter showed a public spiritedness as early as his graduation from Harvard College in 1900, when he became the first director of Harvard's Phillips Brooks House, a center dedicated to religious and social work.[43] Two years later, he took up a position with the international YMCA and was posted to India, where he served as national secretary in Calcutta from 1902-08 and again from 1911-17. While there, Carter saw first-hand the impact of British imperialism and developed a fondness for the Indian people that lasted for the rest of his life. Upon U.S. entry into World War I, Carter served as chief secretary of the YMCA attached to the American Expeditionary

---

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 151.
[43] Anson Phelps Stokes, "Distinguished Servant: Edward C. Carter," *Berkshire [Mass.] Evening Eagle,* Nov. 26, 1954.

Force in Paris (1917-19) and later as foreign secretary with the British YMCA (1920-22), where he became friends with Lionel Curtis and other members of the Round Table movement. Based on this extensive international experience with the YMCA and expressed interest in the study of race and labor relations, Carter found himself personally involved in the early development of the Institute of Pacific Relations, traveling to the first conference in Hawaii in 1925 and one year later assuming the role of secretary to the American council. He immediately made his mark as an expert organizer and fundraiser within the American council, and during a period of transition for the organization in 1933, he was elected to the top administrator's post in the international secretariat's office.

Because Carter was the central figure within the international IPR during the 1930s and 40s, the question of his ideological inclinations has been a subject of often heated debate. During and after World War II, critics accused him of harboring sympathy with Soviet and Chinese communism and (inadvertently or not) allowing the IPR to become a "front" for Communist infiltration of American experts on Asia.[44] Carter was indeed a man of the left, but critics were wrong to peg him as driven by ideology. Looking back on this time, William Holland had a far more accurate description of his mentor as "an old-fashioned Christian liberal," with a deep concern for ordinary people, especially in the developing world.[45] It is true that Carter saw international problems in largely economic terms. Deepening poverty, he believed, led to the increasing disintegration of society and war, and thus his rhetoric was often class-centered. In a 1936 speech, for instance, Carter concluded that "the peasants of Japan in their unequal struggle for food and clothing, the share-croppers of the United States

---

[44] See, for example, Anthony Kubek, *How the Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China, 1941-1949* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1963).

[45] Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations,* pp. 139-140.

engulfed in an outworn system, the farmers of Alberta mobilizing to fight debt and soil depreciation, and the villages of China fighting their losing battle are all members of a great unled international community of 'have-nots.'"[46] But he was no propagandist for communist revolution. Carter's aim was to rouse the "haves," especially Americans, to a sense of responsibility to help the less fortunate.[47]

As secretary-general of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Carter elevated colleagues who shared his vision for the Institute and the Pacific region in general. One of the most notable of these figures was Owen Lattimore, who in 1933 became the new editor of *Pacific Affairs*, the IPR's quarterly journal. Raised in China by his school-teacher parents, Lattimore briefly attended Harvard College but received the bulk of his education about Asia firsthand through his extensive travels in Mongolia and Manchuria. Fluent in Chinese, Russian and Mongol, he was regarded as the foremost American expert on central Asia, and later became the longtime director of the Page School of International Diplomacy at the Johns Hopkins University (1939-53). Even more than Carter, Lattimore later found himself a prominent target of McCarthyist attacks in the postwar period for his supposed communist bias, and a central figure in the blame-game for the "loss" of China (see Chapter Five). Lattimore was no more communist than Carter, but he shared Carter's broad anti-imperial sensibilities, and in the 1930s he set about to transform *Pacific Affairs* from a somewhat staid and anodyne journal into one that was far livelier and unafraid to carry bold opinion pieces sharply rebuking Japanese aggression. Under Lattimore's direction in the 1930s, the journal became more engaged in the debates over world affairs and thus more subject to criticism. "Above all, we

[46] Edward C. Carter Remarks, Dec. 18, 1936, in Box 4, "American Council," Pacific Relations files, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.
[47] In the same spirit of humanitarianism, Carter served as president of Russian War Relief and on the board of United China Relief during World War II and afterwards. Carter's association with Russian War Relief in particular became a source of controversy, and only emboldened critics to affirm Carter's status as a "stooge" for communism. Little has been written on Russian War Relief; see Carter papers, UVM.

attempt to avoid a 'static' presentation of issues, but to show, instead, the way in which things are going and the way in which they are likely to go," he wrote in an unsigned editorial in late 1938.[48] This attitude was in line with the general temper of the Institute of Pacific Relations under Carter's helm, on the razor's edge between analysis and advocacy.

One of Carter's greatest assets was his ability to cultivate powerful financial supporters to the Institute's side, most notably the Rockefeller Foundation. As secretary of the American council in the late 1920s and early 1930s, Carter was an active and able fundraiser, securing upwards of $30,000 yearly from the Rockefellers even through the early difficult years of the depression. As secretary-general of the international secretariat, Carter continued to draw from the same well, winning $50,000 per year for the international research fund several years running. By the latter part of the decade, three sources—the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Carnegie Corporation—contributed close to half of the American council's budget. The American council, in turn, provided by far the greatest contribution to the international IPR's fund. Rockefeller Foundation officials frequently urged Carter to broaden his contributor base, and kept the group on a year-to-year stipend, but they always came through, convinced of the Institute's unique contribution to Pacific research and international understanding. Large contributions such as these continued to fund the bulk of the Institute's projects all the way through the 1940s.[49]

The personal interest of John D. Rockefeller III himself in the IPR's activities was particularly valuable in putting the Institute on sound financial footing. Rockefeller

---

[48] Unsigned editorial, "On the Question of Being 'Pro' or 'Anti,'" *Pacific Affairs,* Vol. XI, No. 4 (Dec. 1938): 495-498.

[49] Financial documents [various], in Rockefeller Foundation Grant files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 350, Folder 4171, RAC.

attended the 1929 Institute conference in Kyoto, and afterwards maintained a close relationship with its program and with Carter in particular. In early 1937, for instance, Rockefeller wrote a letter of introduction for Carter to Malcolm Aldrich, the president and chairman of the charitable organization the Commonwealth Fund. "While I very rarely write letters of this nature I am glad to do so in this instance for two reasons: first because I think that the Institute of Pacific Relations is doing a swell job, if I may use the expression, and second Mr. Carter is such a fine and exceedingly interesting person that I know you would enjoy meeting him," Rockefeller wrote Aldrich.[50] One year later, at the behest of Frederick Vanderbilt Field—a top American IPR staffer and wealthy scion in his own right—Rockefeller organized a dinner for Carter and invited William A.M. Burden, the investment banker and philanthropist. "During the evening," Field boldly suggested to Rockefeller, "you could subtly lead the conversation around to the Far East situation so that Carter would have the chance to hold forth on how much we know and how good we are." Rockefeller did hold the dinner, and later reported to Field that Carter indeed had found his mark: "Mr. Carter was grand, as usual. He couldn't have been more interesting and I think everybody enjoyed it a lot."[51] Through such gatherings Carter managed to increase the pool of IPR donors significantly. Between 1935 and 1936 alone, the American council increased their number of contributors from 170 individuals and six companies to 452 individuals and 37 companies.[52]

---

[50] John D. Rockefeller III to Malcolm Aldrich, Jan. 12, 1937, in Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller—World Affairs files, Record Group III 2 Q, Series 213, Box 9, Folder 63, RAC.

[51] Burden remained in contact with Carter and the IPR for the next few years. In 1945, when he was serving as assistant secretary of commerce, Burden was invited to attend the IPR's international conference in Hot Springs, Virginia, as an American delegate. Frederick V. Field to John D. Rockefeller III, Jan. 24, 1938; and Rockefeller to Field, Feb. 28, 1938, in Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller—World Affairs files, Record Group III 2 Q, Series 213, Box 10, Folder 71, RAC.

[52] John D. Rockefeller III to Frederick V. Field, March 22, 1937, in Box 140, "Rockefeller—Family," Pacific Relations, COL.

By moving the Institute's international headquarters from Hawaii to New York City, Carter not only put himself in closer contact with American donors, but also signaled his interest in bringing a higher international profile for his projects. Enlisting greater European and Soviet participation in the IPR thus became a priority. After a few trips with fellow Institute officials to make contacts with Asian scholars in the USSR, Carter oversaw the creation of an active Soviet IPR council in late 1934, and welcomed two Soviet delegates to the 1936 IPR conference held in Yosemite, California.[53] Meanwhile, a Dutch IPR council, composed of businessmen and scholars from the Netherlands as well as the Netherlands East Indies, officially formed around the same time. In addition, a French council organized itself and brought to Yosemite a small but enthusiastic delegation led by the leftist former prime minister Albert Sarraut.[54] Upon the conclusion of the Yosemite conference, Sarraut traveled to New York and to Washington, D.C., where he met President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the White House and discussed the French position in the Pacific and other matters stemming from the IPR conference. Sarraut's report to the Minister of Foreign Affairs concluded that the French delegation's

[53] Soviet participation in the IPR's international conferences began and ended with the 1936 conference in Yosemite. The two delegates included the chairman of the USSR council, V.E. Motylev, who served as the director of the Institute of the Great Soviet World Atlas and a professor at the Institute of National Economy in Moscow. The second delegate, Vladimir Romm, was the United States correspondent for the Soviet newspaper, *Izvestia.* W.L. Holland and Kate Mitchell, eds., *Problems of the Pacific, 1936: Aims and Results of Social and Economic Policies in Pacific Countries. Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Yosemite National Park, California, 15-29 August 1936* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 440.

[54] Sarraut, who was also a former governor-general of French Indochina, rhapsodically recounted his impressions at a plenary session near the end of the IPR conference in Yosemite: "For the past fourteen days we have lived near one another in a charming international life—it was a universe in miniature; our different races have mixed easily in cordial relations towards which each one contributed his smiles and the best he could give; we exchanged in a brotherly way the pure water and the tomato juice; Americans and Japanese ladies have danced to the same rhythm; Russians and Chinese ladies have shared the pleasures of the same blues; and with jolly enthusiasm the masculine and feminine representatives of three-fourths of the universe have mixed the bubblings of their cheerfulness in the rapprochements of the barbecue. … Our civilizations are not irreconcilable; they are not contradictory; I have never believed, I would never believe in the 'inevitable' hostility of the East and the West. I think that to the contrary we can mix the brightness and the beauties of these civilizations, as the most different flowers combine themselves together to make up the harmony of a splendid garden." Secretariat 1936, Document 45, in RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 350, Folder 4175, RAC.

trip to the United States was useful in overturning American misapprehensions regarding their position in Indochina, and that the French retained "*un prestige certain*" among a healthy number of American citizens.[55] With this growing interest of top intellectuals and politicians from around the world, Carter was well on his way to making the Institute a more representative as well as prominent international body.

Carter's success in raising the profile of the Institute opened up new questions about the international body's non-governmental status. The newly admitted French council was run through the Comité d'études des problèmes du Pacifique (CEPP) with direct financial support from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs.[56] Sarraut and other leaders clearly saw the IPR as an informal means of keeping tabs on the Asia-Pacific region and influencing American public opinion. The admittance of a Soviet council, meanwhile, may have been a triumph of inclusivity, but very few Institute leaders could argue that participants from the USSR were prepared to give their own view of foreign relations independent of the Kremlin. European councils were not the only countries interested in using the IPR for their own purposes. As Tomoko Akami has shown, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs was an active financial contributor and participant in the direction of the Japanese council.[57]

In the United States, meanwhile, the American council had a far more complicated relationship with the State Department, largely because of the competing personalities of Edward Carter and Stanley Hornbeck, the chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Hornbeck had been one of the IPR's founders when he was a lecturer at

---

[55] Sarraut to Monsieur le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Oct. 5, 1936, in CPC E-Asie 1918-1940, Iles d'Océanie, Vol. 85, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, (MAE), Paris.

[56] The CEPP was founded in 1931 as a private organization by Albert Sarraut and others. In 1933, they requested a 20,000-franc stipend from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to attend the IPR conference in Banff, Canada. Three years later, they made a similar request for travel support, as well as for money to pay dues to the IPR's Pacific Council as a full-fledged national council. CPC E-Asie 1918-1940, Iles d'Océanie, Vol. 85, MAE.

[57] Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 110.

Harvard. Once in the State Department, he developed a reputation as one of the most influential East Asian experts in the country. Hornbeck wielded an influence over American regional policy that few could match, yet his personality won few admirers. Contemporaries took note of his bullying behavior, his violent prejudices, and his undiplomatic behavior concerning matters with which he disagreed. John Carter Vincent, who worked under Hornbeck in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, described his boss as "irascible and pigheaded."[58] Now in the corridors of power, Hornbeck saw little reason to use the Institute in any way that might dilute his authority.

During the 1930s, the American council of the IPR sought to elevate its profile by inviting government officials into its membership while at the same time asserting its independence from American policymaking. Executive secretary Frederick V. Field wrote a series of letters in 1936 to Washington officials in the Department of State and Foreign Service officers working in Asia, asking them to join the IPR in a limited-membership capacity. Field explained the outreach program in a letter to Hornbeck:

> We like to have closely associated with our work a number of government officials as well as private citizens, but we do not invite the government officials either to attend our international conferences or to become officers of the organization. In this way we feel that we have the benefit of a close connection with these persons without violating the private and unofficial nature of our activities and deliberations.[59]

Field was a questionable figure, in Hornbeck's mind; the IPR official had recently circulated a memorandum on the purposes of American Far Eastern policy that Hornbeck deemed overly critical.[60] But Field's outreach program did not overstep any bounds. In

---

[58] Quoted in Shizhang Hu, *Stanley Hornbeck and the Open Door Policy, 1919-1937* (Westport, Conn: Greenport Press, 1995), p. 5. Hornbeck is best known for steering President Franklin Roosevelt's policies in a pro-Chinese, or more appropriately, an anti-Japanese, direction during the 1930s.

[59]Frederick V. Field to Stanley K. Hornbeck, May 26, 1936, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/62, NARA.

[60] Hornbeck to Edward C. Carter, unofficial and confidential, July 18, 1936, in Box 45, Stanley K. Hornbeck Papers, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (HOO), Palo Alto, CA.

the end, Hornbeck told Foreign Service officials that the State Department would "not seek to discourage" them from joining the American IPR.[61] Numerous American consuls and high commissioners serving in Asia added their names to the IPR rolls, along with more high-ranking officials like Joseph C. Grew, Ambassador to Japan, and John V.A. MacMurray, Ambassador to Turkey and former chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Others, however, declined the invitation, citing a conflict of interest with their official duties. Such figures included Maxwell Hamilton, Hornbeck's successor at the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, as well as Francis B. Sayre, assistant secretary of state.[62]

Hornbeck's relationship with Edward Carter was especially fraught. The autocratic State Department official could not have been more different from the suave IPR secretary-general. Yet Carter was indisputably a useful source. Carter's many private contacts in Asia gave him a broad perspective on regional issues, which he frequently shared with Hornbeck and other top officials in Washington. After Carter returned from a trip to Asia in 1937, he paid a visit to Hornbeck, who then scheduled a meeting between Carter and Army and Navy intelligence officers at the War Department. Carter had been in Peiping at the time of the Marco Polo Bridge attack that formally launched the Sino-Japanese War. He also described his travels to Manchuria, where he had met the senior Japanese administrator Naoki Hoshino, and gave his impressions of Japanese naval installations in North Korean ports, of which American army and naval intelligence had little information at the time.[63] When Carter desired a visit with Secretary of State Cordell Hull in the spring of 1939 before another such trip, Hornbeck urged Hull to meet with him, calling the IPR secretary-general a valuable "political

---

[61] Stanley K. Hornbeck to Willys R. Peck, Counselor of American Embassy, Nanking, China, June 1, 1936, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/63, NARA.

[62] Maxwell Hamilton to Margaret R. Taylor, membership and finance secretary, American council, IPR, April 2, 1940; Francis B. Sayre to Frederick V. Field, Feb. 9, 1937, both in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations, NARA.

[63] Edward C. Carter to Allen Wardwell, Esq., March 15, 1952, in Box 9, Folder 8, Carter papers, UVM.

missionary," and acknowledged that the Institute was "very sympathetic" toward American policies in the Far East.[64]

Despite Hornbeck's more than 20-year close association with Carter and the IPR, the State Department official nevertheless remained wary of the peripatetic Institute head. When writing letters of introduction for Carter to American consul generals in Shanghai, Hong Kong and elsewhere, Hornbeck called Carter a "friend." Yet significantly, in addition to the formal letters of introduction to these consuls, Hornbeck included a private note warning them about Carter's penchant for overstepping boundaries regarding his relationships with governmental figures: "He has never quite grasped the line of distinction between what a responsible official can do and what a responsible official cannot do." Hornbeck went on still further:

> In my own contacts with [Carter] since I became an officer of the Government, I have made it a point to try to be helpful and to be frank but always to be on guard against giving information which I would not be willing to have imparted to third parties. … The Secretary of the IPR is of necessity walking on eggs and carrying eggs in a basket. I am glad to be helpful toward preventing undesired breaking of eggs; and, incidentally, with that thought constantly in mind I am not putting any of my eggs in the pathway or in the basket.[65]

Hornbeck clearly saw a sharp line dividing the State Department and that of the IPR, however sympathetic they may have been toward one another's work. The Department's job was to help maintain American national interests abroad. The IPR, however, had an international constituency, with a broad agenda to promote international understanding. It was a flexible mission, subject to the strategy of its headstrong secretary-general.

The ambivalent reaction by Hornbeck to the IPR is important to note, especially in the context of postwar charges of collusion between the Institute and the State

[64] Hornbeck to Hull, April 13, 1939, in Box 45, Hornbeck papers, HOO.
[65] Hornbeck, private letter to Clarence E. Gauss, American Consul General, Shanghai, China; carbon addressed to Addison E. Southard, American Consul General, Hong Kong; April 27, 1939, in Box 45, Hornbeck papers, HOO.

Department's Far Eastern division over American policy in China. IPR historian Tomoko Akami has pointed out that some Institute officials became increasingly "state-centered" during these years as the war drew nearer and public-private distinctions collapsed.[66] Greater contact between private and public officials, however, did not necessarily mean a greater alignment in their policies. In the case of Hornbeck, it only reaffirmed the distinctions between the work of American diplomats in Asia and the work of private Pacific internationalists.

During the course of the 1930s, Edward Carter transformed the Institute of Pacific Relations from a community-building effort based in Hawaii into a serious international research institute and quasi-think tank for Asian and Pacific affairs. Scholars, businessmen and even diplomats joined the Institute as a means of receiving the latest information on the conditions of the people, land and economy in the Pacific region. Foundations pledged considerable financial support to the group, recognizing its unique contribution as a non-governmental organization. In addition to its research agenda and publication record, the IPR's conferences earned an international reputation as a relatively objective and respectable forum for the airing of contentious issues, featuring national councils whose regional representation exceeded that of the League of Nations. Not surprisingly, governmental officials in Europe, North America and Asia saw IPR councils in their own country as useful entities to monitor if not control. But despite the increasing state-centeredness of various national councils by the end of the 1930s, the IPR's international secretariat, under the direction of Carter, had an agenda separate from any one country, including the United States. The mission of these Pacific internationalists ultimately was not to support or defend any one national interest, but rather work toward the reconciliation of regional interests through international research

---

[66] Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, pp. 253-280.

projects and conferences. The project of cultivating an international sensibility in the peoples of the Pacific, however, was still in its infancy, and would be tested even more severely as the war clouds gathering over the Pacific finally broke into a storm.

Chapter Two

"A True New Order": Pacific Internationalists at War, 1938-1945

"You will be glad to know that the IPR was manning its feeble guns when Japan struck," Edward Carter wrote Sydnor H. Walker, a top Rockefeller Foundation official, on December 12, 1941.[1] Five days earlier, Carter was attending a weekend regional conference at a Cleveland, Ohio, country club hosted by the American council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, when the first newsflashes were relayed from the White House regarding the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. The IPR secretary-general promptly announced the news to the stunned international gathering. "A few thought I was putting on an Orson Welles stunt," he dryly recalled, "but they soon realized the realities." Within moments, a few isolationist Republicans in attendance promptly declared their willingness to fight, and Europeans expressed relief that the United States would now finally become a wartime ally. One of those in attendance, John W. Holmes, the new secretary of the Canadian Institute of International Relations, wrote to Carter immediately after the conference saying he hoped the attack would not sap the IPR's resolve but instead crystallize its purpose: "The vigour and intelligence of the discussions should leave no doubt that the IPR is preparing and can prepare for a true new order in the region which is its special concern."[2]

The outbreak of World War II was a boon to the IPR's profile. The League of Nations may have shown itself to be impotent, but the spirit of internationalism remained stronger than ever. As the most prominent regional organization operating in the Pacific,

[1] Edward C. Carter to Miss Sydnor H. Walker, Dec. 12, 1941, in Rockefeller Foundation grant files, Record Group 1.1, Series 200, Box 351, Folder 4178, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.
[2] John W. Holmes to Carter, quoted in *Ibid.*

the IPR found itself ideally situated to help the Allies. The United States government found particular utility in the Institute's research and publication output, which catered both to policymakers and the public at large. Lauchlin Currie, special assistant to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, wrote in 1942 that IPR-commissioned studies were of "distinct use" to the White House. "I do not know of any agency inside the government or out which is in a position to do the work which the Institute has been doing," Currie concluded. Meanwhile, the State Department and various military agencies purchased millions of copies of American IPR pamphlets during the war as an introduction to the Asia-Pacific region for American soldiers and university students. Government officials praised the Institute's work as a useful means of educating Americans not only about the social and economic forces in Asia, but about longer-term foreign policy objectives in the region. Sumner Welles, the acting U.S. secretary of state in 1942, touted the IPR's ability to develop "an informed public opinion" on foreign affairs. In honor of its wartime service, the American IPR received the Navy Certificate of Achievement.[3]

This chapter focuses on the way in which Pacific internationalists took advantage of World War II to press forward their regional agenda. It is not a comprehensive examination of the Institute of Pacific Relations' wartime conferences, an effort that has merited its own exhaustive study.[4] Rather, this chapter examines the behind-the-scenes

---

[3] At least one Army officer attempted to nominate the American IPR for a similar award but found that no Army commendation existed at that time for publishers of wartime materials. He nevertheless wished to make clear to AIPR officials that they had "made a definite contribution to the Army in this war and have more than earned any award the Army could give you." Col. Joseph I. Greene to Miss Rosamond Lee, Nov. 19, 1945, in Box 104, "U.S. Navy Award, November 1945," Pacific Relations files, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

[4] Yutoko Sasaki, "The Struggle for Scholarly Objectivity: Unofficial Diplomacy and the Institute of Pacific Relations from the Sino-Japanese War to the McCarthy Era" (Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 2005). Sasaki's dissertation demonstrates the way in which these wartime conferences encouraged extensive debates, especially between the United States and Great Britain, over the future of the colonial world. For the wider context in which these debates took place, see Wm. Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978) and Christopher G. Thorne, *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War Against Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). It should be noted that Sasaki does not extend his analysis into the

maneuvering of Institute officials, especially Edward Carter, in the effort to shape private ties between Asia and the West. As the following pages make clear, Carter certainly knew how to manipulate ties with state officials, most dramatically in his American government-sponsored trip to Asia in 1943. This does not mean, however, that he was beholden to them, as Stanley Hornbeck and other State Department officials already recognized. Carter and his Pacific allies maintained an independent vision of a post-imperial world, a vision that often supported the more liberal elements of President Roosevelt's administration but also pushed them to stand up for the democratic ideals they espoused.

Carter shepherded the IPR into playing an active role in the debate over the postwar world in at least two important ways. First, in 1938 he initiated a far-reaching new research project called the Inquiry—modeled on the World War I-era effort—into the causes of the Sino-Japanese War and their possible resolution. This project resulted in a series of reports, published in the early 1940s, which outlined possible regional solutions to the war. Second, Carter personally involved himself in the development of new IPR initiatives in India, and acted as a facilitator of Indian-Chinese dialogue through his personal relationships with prominent Asian leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru and Chiang Kai-shek. Indian and Chinese nationalists alike saw the IPR as an important means for Asian intellectuals to solidify international connections outside of an imperial framework. Through this informal dialogue as well as pamphleteering, Carter's Institute not only promoted the development of an independent Asia, but in fact actively forged the connections that would generate a greater postwar regional sensibility.

"unofficial diplomacy" of Institute officials on wartime trips to Asia, nor does he examine any of the Institute's postwar conferences.

POST-WAR WORLDS

In late 1937, within a few months of the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war, Carter formulated a new research project through the international secretariat that sought to examine the sources of the crisis and propose long-term solutions. Called the Inquiry, the project proposal quickly earned a substantial $90,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to sponsor a series of studies to examine the issue from different national perspectives. The development of the Inquiry was significant because it made clear that the Institute of Pacific Relations was prepared to court controversy by tackling the most explosive and political issues, even as leaders professed the group's continued status as a disinterested and scholarly body—a tightrope that became considerably more perilous in the midst of war. Another significant characteristic was the fact that the Inquiry was organized and run through the international secretariat of the IPR, and not its constituent national councils, which provided Carter and his staff with considerably more power over the direction and scope of the project. If it had not been evident previously, the Inquiry showcased the international mission of the Institute, above and beyond the interests of any one nation.

Carter's bold initiative met with almost immediate resistance. The launch of the Inquiry series set into motion a protest movement by the Japanese council that would eventually result in their withdrawal from the IPR in early 1941. Kenzo Takayanagi, a professor of English law at Tokyo Imperial University, had attended every IPR conference since 1925 and was taken aback when he learned of the Institute's new Inquiry project.[5] The Japanese council was not consulted in advance, and Takayanagi reported that his fellow members felt as though the series was concocted behind their

[5] Summary of conversations between members of the IPR Committee of Chatham House with Dr. Takayanagi and M. Dennery, Chatham House, Sept. 1, 1938, in CHA 6/1/6, Royal Institute of International Affairs archives (RIIA), London.

backs. Furthermore, the Japanese had little faith in the impartiality of the international secretariat's staff. Carter, along with Research Secretary William Holland and *Pacific Affairs* editor Owen Lattimore had each made speeches in the wake of the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War provoking Japanese criticism, Takayanagi reported. But the Japanese were not alone in their criticism of the project. The British at Chatham House privately agreed with the Japanese critique of Carter, believing that the international secretariat should act merely as a liaison between national councils, and not engage in scholarly projects of its own. G.E. Hubbard, an officer in the Foreign Office's Political Intelligence department, decried the Inquiry to Chatham House staffer Margaret Cleeve as evidence of "sloppy internationalism," with standards "well below our own" and with a research direction that was "vague and unsystematic."[6] Hubbard even went so far as to recommend a reevaluation of Chatham House's affiliation with the IPR. But whereas war ultimately cut off Japan from the Institute, British officials gamely soldiered on with their wartime allies in the IPR, determined to take their licks in an effort to reconcile strident American anti-colonialism and European control in Asia.

Even more than attempting to understand the Sino-Japanese War, the Inquiry series set out to configure new arrangements for the region to ensure a lasting peace. In many ways the IPR was entering an already crowded field of scholars, prognosticators, and idealists all seeking to refashion the world in the midst of a global crisis. Those with an Atlantic bias already had a clear lead in proposing new forms of international cooperation, especially between the United States and Europe, as the European troubles deepened in the 1930s. Lionel Curtis' *Civitas Dei*[7] repurposed his older arguments for the unification of the British Commonwealth and the United States, while the American

---

[6] G.E. Hubbard to Miss Margaret Cleeve, Jan. 8, 1940, in CHA 6/4/51, RIIA.
[7] Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939).

author Clarence Streit's *Union Now* (1939)[8] offered a variation on the same theme: a federal union of world democracies, eventually leading to a common world government. But while these authors made an effective case for cooperation between the United States and Europe, they had little to say about the Pacific region. With the Japanese invasion and occupation of French Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines, and perhaps most dramatically, the fall of the British naval base at Singapore in February of 1942, it suddenly became clear that the old imperial order had come to an end. But what would replace this order? Could former colonies survive on their own as viable democracies? What kind of regional structure could support their efforts? And finally, what relation should such a potential regional organization have with a new international order at the conclusion of the war?

Through its Inquiry series, the Institute of Pacific Relations took the lead in assessing potential postwar regional solutions for the various countries in "Southeast Asia," a term that the Institute helped bring into existence.[9] One of the first major monographs of the series was Percy E. Corbett's *Post-War Worlds*, published in 1942. Corbett, a Canadian professor of international law, taught at McGill University and later at Yale University. His association with the Institute of Pacific Relations was a close one; he later served as head of the Canadian national council and eventually became the chairman of the IPR's Pacific Council. In *Post-War Worlds,* Corbett proposed the creation of an Eastern League, first through the cooperation of Western powers, but ultimately one that could function largely on its own.[10] The League's organization would

---

[8] Clarence K. Streit, *Union Now: The Proposal for Inter-Democracy Federal Union* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940).

[9] Many give credit to Lord Mountbatten's Southeast Asia Command as the origin of the term, but William L. Holland noted that "Southeast Asia" was used in several IPR publications as early as 1941. Paul F. Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations: The Memoirs of William L. Holland* (Tokyo: Ryukei shosha, 1995), pp. 123-4.

[10] P.E. Corbett, *Post-War Worlds* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1942), p. 74.

include a non-aggression pact, a regional assembly, a military commission, Pacific court, a joint economic and financial commission, as well as a commission for social legislation. The essential "nucleus" of the League would include China, Japan, India and the Indonesian Union (consisting of Netherlands East Indies, Indochina, Malaya, the Philippines, Thailand and Burma). Corbett supported colonial self-determination, but claimed that individual national freedom must give way to the larger imperatives of community. Corbett's regional approach attempted to bridge the claims of nationalism and sovereignty on the one hand with the promise of international peace and cooperation—a compromise that other IPR members would attempt to forge in the coming years.[11]

Corbett's regional scheme was advanced in a special supplemental edition of *Fortune* magazine in August 1942. The editors of *Fortune*, under the direction of their Asia-oriented publisher and IPR trustee Henry Luce, were similarly bold in their vision for fashioning Southeast Asia. They proposed an ambitious plan to create a "new and somewhat experimental state" out of Thailand, Malaya, the Netherlands East Indies and Portuguese Timor—a regional federation. The editors acknowledged the challenge of federating such a diverse population—"illiterate, heterogeneous, completely lacking in common traditions or political training"—into a single unit, yet they were not deterred. They emphasized some broad similarities among them: pre-capitalist, agrarian societies, whose primary social unit was the village and the patriarchal family, and who all felt a shared sense of exploitation at the hands of European imperialists. But in contrast to Corbett's Eastern League, which proposed a diminishing Western presence, Luce and his *Fortune* editors advocated a more paternalistic "Pacific Council," composed of all members of the United Nations whose interests touched on the Pacific—not to be

[11] P.E. Corbett, *Supplement to "Post-War Worlds,"* Secretariat Paper No. 3, Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Mont Tremblant, Quebec, Canada (Dec. 1942), pp. 8-9.

confused with the IPR's governing board by the same name. The United States would be allowed, through this scheme, to keep island bases in the Pacific as "an international highway by which the freedom of the Pacific may be protected."[12] The editors at *Fortune* insisted that the creation of a Pacific Council as a final judicial arbiter over Pacific matters would not be a renewed form of imperialism, but rather "a new international framework in which the creative spirit of East and West can work dynamically together for a better world," a view that could have been taken verbatim from the pages of an IPR journal.[13]

Within the State Department's Far East division, discussions about the potential for a federation scheme in Southeast Asia provoked added interest in the summer of 1942. One draft memorandum supported the idea that the countries involved—the Philippines, French Indochina, Netherlands East Indies, Burma, and possibly Thailand—could function as a unit, with a central capital in Manila. The proposal justified such federation as a natural grouping, claiming that the inhabitants were almost all engaged in the production of raw materials and spoke "related Malayo-Polynesian languages and are racially interrelated." The memorandum summarily dismissed potential problems regarding the association of independent and dependent states with a single sentence: "Differences in sovereignty need not interfere with a federation of the type in mind." One of the first duties of this federation, the memorandum continued, would be to adopt common programs for universal education, set into motion steps for greater political autonomy, and give assurances regarding the establishment of liberal economic policies. Indeed, the primary benefit of such a federal arrangement, this memo suggested, would be a guarantee of an open door in Southeast Asia, "to assure to all the peoples of the

[12] *Fortune*, Supplement: The United States in a New World, II: Pacific Relations (Aug. 1942): 1-12.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

world equality of opportunity to acquire on a non-discriminatory basis for legitimate and peaceful purposes the products of the area within the federation."[14] Economic opportunity for American businesses was now added to strategic advantages in favoring a regional organization in Southeast Asia.

By the time of the IPR's international conference in December 1942, there was considerable enthusiasm for new regional association in the Pacific. Over 10 days in Mont Tremblant, Quebec, delegates discussed various possibilities for a postwar order. One of the most talked-about plans was initiated by Lord Hailey, the chairman of the British delegation and one of the most respected colonial experts in the United Kingdom. In his opening address to the conference, Hailey proposed the creation a "Pacific Zone Council," composed of the major sovereign powers in the region, which would act to safeguard the peace in Asia through military and civil activities, but also to create joint policies to foster economic development of the area. Rather than simply acquiesce to the liquidation of British Pacific colonies, Hailey offered that the creation of a Pacific Zone Council would oversee "the periodic review of the progress made in the promotion of self-governing institutions in the dependencies, and in the improvement of their standard of living."[15] Hailey's regional council essentially invited local sovereign powers—particularly the United States—to join in the administration of the regional dependencies, rather than submit them to direct international supervision.[16] It was an ingenious way to acquiesce to the burst of Asian regionalism but at the same time ensure Western control.

---

[14] "Indonesian or Malaysian Federation," Document P-42, Aug. 14, 1942, in RG 59, Lot File 54D 109, Philippine and Southeast Asia Division, 1944-58, Microfilm C0014, Reel 6, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.

[15] Lord Hailey, "A British View of a Far Eastern Settlement," *War and Peace in the Pacific: A Preliminary Report of the Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations on Wartime and Post-war Cooperation of the United Nations in the Pacific and the Far East, Mount Tremblant, Quebec, December 4-14, 1942* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943), pp. 6-15.

[16] The same essential invitation to the Americans came from South African Prime Minister Jan Smuts in the pages of *Life* magazine later that month. In his article, Smuts advocated a system of "enlarged colonial units," grouping them together for greater ease of administration, and handing over the responsibility of

Hailey's proposed Pacific Zone Council suddenly altered the dynamics of the debate over regional machinery in the Pacific. Such a council, if initiated, could serve to refashion the old colonial empires but not dismantle them. This was not the "true new order" Carter envisioned for the post-war world, nor was it what many Asian nationalists contemplated. Not surprisingly, Chinese and Indian participants at the 1942 conference offered different emphases regarding postwar regional solutions. K.M. Panikkar, one of the Indian observers, believed that such a regional scheme should place India in the driver's seat.[17] The former editor of the *Hindustan Times* and future Indian ambassador to China insisted that India could take the lead in a post-Japanese "co-prosperity sphere" for the countries of Southeast Asia. Panikkar warned that the prospects of a regional economic breakdown in Southeast Asia were real, and only the establishment of closer economic and political ties between India and Southeast Asia could help avert such a regional calamity. Meanwhile, S.R. Chow, a Chinese international relations professor living in the United States, submitted a data paper in which he touted the idea of a "Pacific Association" including China, the Soviet Union, India, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Great Britain, Japan and Thailand. While Chow welcomed the participation of other countries in his planned association, China served as the true linchpin. A fully restored China, free from foreign economic and political interference, he wrote, could be a decisive player in gradually leading the way to Asian democracy, as well as a "great moral force for peace and justice throughout the whole region."[18]

---

general or common policies to a regional commission or council. Smuts said he had no doubt that the "partnership" of the United States in "overhead colonial controls would be cordially welcomed" by the British Commonwealth. "The British Colonial Empire," *Life,* Vol. 13, No. 26 (Dec. 28, 1942): 11-14.

[17] Panikkar's data paper to the IPR conference would later be expanded and published as *The Future of South-East Asia: An Indian View* (New York: Macmillian, 1943).

[18] S.R. Chow, *Winning the Peace in the Pacific* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), pp. 91-94.

Edward Carter and other IPR leaders recognized that any workable postwar solution for the region could not simply be dictated by Westerners but must have the active involvement of Asian powers—most importantly, China and India. These two countries boasted the oldest civilizations in Asia, yet they were just beginning to think of themselves as regional powers unto themselves through their respective nationalist movements. One of Carter's principal wartime objectives was to reconcile the enormous ambitions of these two large countries and facilitate an international sensibility among their leading intellectuals. It was not an easy task, as the countries themselves were internally divided. In India, Congress party and Muslim League adherents vied for preeminence in the nationalist uprising against British rule. Meanwhile in China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's ruling Kuomintang nationalist party was increasingly defensive against the growing insurgency of Mao Tse-tung's Chinese Communist movement. These internal political debates starkly delineated India and China's contacts with the outside world. But through Carter's deep connections in both countries, he helped initiate Sino-Indian relationships that would alter Asian international relations for years to come.

INDIA AND THE PACIFIC

Edward Carter was convinced that a critical foundation for any "true new order" in postwar Asia was to have an independent India take on greater regional leadership, yet his role in helping this process has been overlooked. During World War II, Indian nationalists escalated their rhetoric against imperial control and advocated developing their own approach to international questions, distinct from that of the British Raj. A major problem was that there was little institutional apparatus to develop such a perspective. The only foreign relations think-tank in India, the Indian Institute of

International Affairs (IIIA), had been founded in 1935 as a direct product of Chatham House, and was generally deferential to the Government of India. Carter, whose interest in and relations with India traced back to his pre-World War I days as a YMCA officer there, set out to change matters. Through his numerous contacts with prominent Indian intellectuals, especially Jawaharlal Nehru, Carter helped encourage a movement to organize a new organization, the Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA), which spearheaded the first Asian Relations Conference (1947) and served for decades as India's primary independent international relations think-tank.

The story of Carter's role in the development of the Indian Council of World Affairs has greater significance than merely revising the early institutional history of this specific organization. First, an understanding of the influence of the IPR on Indian intellectuals helps explain the way in which their international interests developed in a specifically Pacific sense, especially regarding India's relations with China and Southeast Asia. Second, the prospect of affiliation with the IPR boosted Indian internationalists on the world stage long before formal independence. Finally, this episode alters our understanding of the origins of Asian regionalism and its consequences for the postwar East-West partnership. Western internationalists, working in tandem with Asian leaders, helped foster regional relationships that would define the post-colonial order. Carter's success in nurturing an independent Indian IPR national council tested Anglo-American relations, but generated enormous goodwill on the part of Indian intellectuals that carried over into the postwar period.

The manner in which Carter carried out his India initiative was indicative of the ability of a uniquely well-connected private citizen to navigate the worlds between private and official state business in multiple countries.[19] Furthermore, it was an effort

[19] The following account is partially drawn from Edward Carter's own remembrance of events many years later, and in which he, not surprisingly, cast himself in a central role and favorable light. Carter was

that developed over the course of many years. Well before the war, in 1934, Carter and his wife were traveling in England when Carter's British friend Philip Kerr (now Lord Lothian) invited him over to one of Kerr's ancestral homes in Norfolk, in East Anglia. Among the other guests was Sir Austen Chamberlain, the former British foreign secretary. Like John D. Rockefeller, III, and his dinner guests on other occasions, Chamberlain was favorably impressed by the new IPR secretary-general and invited him to a private luncheon in London to discuss Asian affairs. Upon learning that Carter was about to travel through Asia, Chamberlain offered to put him in touch with the Viceroy of India, Lord Willingdon. When Carter and his wife arrived in Bombay a few weeks later, Willingdon extended an invitation for them to stay at the Viceroy's House in New Delhi. For a few days, Carter answered questions about the IPR and the Far East from Viceroy and Lady Willingdon, as well as their guests. During the course of these discussions, Carter made clear that he did not yet recommend the formation of an Indian IPR council, but instead merely wished to establish direct contact with relevant research institutions and prominent intellectuals, a project of which the Viceroy approved.[20]

Carter recognized that the question of Indian representation at IPR conferences was a delicate matter. Years earlier, in 1929, Chatham House had agreed to allow one Indian, Dr. S.K. Datta, to attend the IPR gathering in Kyoto as an observer. Datta, who had served a term as a vice regal nominee on the Legislative Assembly and attended the second Round Table conference in London at the invitation of Mohandas Gandhi, was someone trusted by both British officials and Indian nationalists, and said nothing to

---

writing to Allen Wardwell, a lawyer who was helping the IPR during its defense at the McCarran subcommittee hearings in 1952. Carter was responding to charges that his contacts with prominent Soviet figures was somehow anomalous to his work as IPR secretary-general by recounting other such episodes of high-level discussions. Carter to Wardwell, March 5, 1952, in Box 9, Folder 8, Edward C. Carter papers, University of Vermont archives (UVM), Burlington.

[20] Edward C. Carter to R.C.M. Arnold, Chatham House, April 4, 1939, quoted in "Indian Representation at the IPR Conferences," CHA 6/2/38, RIIA.

upset the British delegation. But in the mid-1930s the opportunity to create a full Indian council was not yet feasible. It was difficult to find Indians, such as Datta, who were both knowledgeable about regional matters and politically palatable to all sides, especially given the context of the ongoing debates over the future of Indian home rule. Furthermore, the IPR constitution did not yet list India as a country eligible for membership; it did not border the Pacific Ocean, or have colonial holdings there. Nevertheless, Carter's conversations with the Viceroy, Datta and others convinced him that an Indian IPR could render valuable service as long as it was "authentically Indian"—in other words, representative of the people as well as free from the patronage of the Viceroy and other British and Indian government officials.[21]

Before IPR affiliation could even be considered, an appropriate Indian group needed to form. Within months after Carter's 1934 visit, one possible organization emerged when Chatham House announced that it had established a branch in India. The Indian Institute of International Affairs (IIIA) was modeled on other Commonwealth institutes (Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) that grew out of the Round Table movement, and was dedicated to the independent inquiry of international relations. The chairman of the IIIA was Ramasamy Mudaliar, a senior leader in India's Justice Party and editor of their journal. But while Mudaliar was a respected politician, some Indian nationalists dismissed him as a British puppet.[22] A member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, Mudaliar was knighted in 1937 and would go on to serve on the Viceroy's Executive Council (1939-42) as well as in the Imperial War Cabinet (1942-45). Unsurprisingly, Mudaliar's Indian Institute did not seek to launch a research program that challenged the British in any way. So when Carter wished to receive an

[21] Carter to Arnold, in *Ibid.*
[22] Editorial, *National Call* (Delhi), Oct. 28, 1942.

"authentically Indian" point of view in the late 1930s, he chose to write either Datta, who was then the principal of Forman College in Lahore, or increasingly, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Congress Party leader at the vanguard of the independence movement.[23]

Early in the summer of 1939 Carter was in the midst of visiting Japan and China on Institute of Pacific Relations business, and had just met with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek when an urgent letter arrived from Datta indicating that he and Nehru wished to meet with Carter in India regarding the establishment of an IPR affiliate.[24] The secretary-general flew into Allahabad, where they originally had intended to meet, but Nehru was stranded in Bombay due to monsoons. The three men decided instead to take separate trains and meet in the small town of Itarsi, halfway between Allahabad and Bombay. By then, Nehru was a well-known political figure, and word of his arrival leaked to the public. Thousands of people greeted his sudden arrival at the train platform, but Nehru, Datta and Carter soon found a quiet place to talk in the home of an English Quaker missionary. As Carter recalled years later, the three of them spent nearly 12 hours discussing the problems of India as well as sharing thoughts on Japan and China.[25] Nehru's long interest in Indian-Chinese partnership, it can be argued, began on this day.

Toward the end of their marathon discussion, Carter put into motion a plan that would bring together Jawaharlal Nehru and Chiang Kai-shek for the first time. Carter told Nehru that it was of the "utmost importance" that he visit China himself. Nehru replied that he had never been formally asked. So upon his return to Allahabad, Carter cabled Liu Yu-Wan, the secretary of the Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations, and suggested that the group invite the Indian leader to China. Carter then boarded his plane for Amsterdam. By the time Carter landed in Europe, Nehru had already cabled, explaining

[23] Edward C. Carter to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Feb. 13, 1940, in Box 7, Folder 7, Carter papers, UVM.
[24] Carter to Wardwell, March 5, 1952, in Box 9, Folder 8, Carter papers, UVM.
[25] *Ibid.*

that he had an invitation not only from the Chinese IPR council but also from the Generalissimo himself. Nehru asked what he should do. Carter replied in one word: "Accept." Years later, Carter recalled Nehru's remarkable visit to China in August 1939:

> [Nehru] flew to Chunking as the guest of the Generalissimo and received an overwhelming reception. He had an exceptional opportunity for a very long talk with the Chiangs for, in the middle of a big state dinner in his honor, there was a Japanese air raid on Chunking. The Chiangs took Nehru alone to one of those deep shelters in the cliffs of war-time Chunking, where for several hours, under rather dramatic circumstances, the three of them were able to quietly discuss the total Asian situation and to begin to examine all the common problems of the two most populated countries of the world: China and India.[26]

Nehru's visit to China was cut short by the outbreak of war in Europe, but this trip initiated a broader India-China relationship for next several years, in which nationalists in both countries began to speak of one another in a fraternal manner.[27] Carter's role in helping bring together these Indian and Chinese leaders made him a trusted figure, and made the IPR a natural site for future Asian regional collaboration.

The outbreak of war between Japan and the Allies in December 1941 thrust India directly into the heart of Pacific matters, and made the question of their participation in the IPR even more pressing. As Carter began planning the next international IPR conference, set for late 1942 in Mont Tremblant, Quebec, he contacted his old friend Datta and asked him to be a participant. Datta, who was by then close to retiring from Forman College, responded with enthusiasm, and noted that he had just seen Nehru for the first time since he and Carter met with him in 1939. "I reminded [Nehru] that it was a result of that visit that he had paid a visit to Chungking," Datta wrote Carter. Datta himself remained an enthusiastic campaigner for Indian-Chinese collaboration. In fact, he had recently written Nehru asking what chances there were of allowing Indian men to

---

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Avinash Mohash Saklani, "Nehru, Chiang Kai-shek and the Second World War," in Madhavi Thampi, ed., *India and China in the Colonial World* (New Delhi: Social Science Press, 2005): 167-182.

sign up and join the Chinese army if the Indian army had no place for them. (Not good, Nehru implied in his response.) In any case, Datta felt that Carter was just the man who was needed more than ever to help "link up" the United States, Great Britain, India and China. "Your place is in India," Datta pleaded. "You could carry on your work on Pacific Relations in this country."[28] But Datta's death a few months later, in addition to Nehru's jailing during the "Quit India" campaign in the summer of 1942, stripped Carter of his two most trusted correspondents in India.

Carter resolved to have a diverse Indian presence at the December 1942 IPR conference, but any prospective group had to be cleared through the Viceroy of India, Lord Linlithgow, who had replaced Willingdon in 1936. Linlithgow clearly had no interest in encouraging Indian nationalists to travel abroad to an international conference, especially given the uncertainty surrounding the "Quit India" movement. In August of 1942, Mohandas Gandhi called for the immediate independence of India, which sparked a national civil disobedience movement that quickly spread throughout India. Fearing greater unrest during a critical period of the war, Linlithgow ordered the arrest of Gandhi, Nehru and most of the top Congress party's leadership, where many would remain incarcerated for the duration of the war. Carter wrote to Lord Halifax, himself a former Viceroy of India and later British foreign secretary, as well as Sir Girija Bajpai, a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, to help plead a case to include a "wider and more representative" body of Indian citizens at the December conference.[29] Linlithgow was in a bind. He could not simply disregard Carter's efforts to bring Indians to the IPR conference, as it was important to maintain good relations with wartime allies, especially

[28] Datta to Carter, March 29, 1942, in Box 7, Folder 9, Carter papers, UVM.
[29] Carter to Chatham House, July 25, 1942, quoted in "Indian Representation at the IPR Conferences," CHA 6/2/38, RIIA.

the United States. Yet he also could not afford to allow the potential public relations disaster of Indian dissent on an international stage.

In the end the Viceroy chose to distance himself from the situation by handing over the responsibility for choosing the Indian delegates to Ramaswami Mudaliar, the chairman of the Indian Institute of International Affairs. All sections of the Indian press, from the Congress party to the Muslim League, derided the resulting delegation as "packed" in favor of British interests.[30] In addition to the "British creation" Mudaliar as chairman, the group included Sir Muhammed Zafrulla Khan, a Muslim judge who was also on the Viceroy's Executive Council; Diwan Bahadur S.E. Runganadhan, a Christian who was also a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India; K.M. Panikkar, foreign minister of Bikaner; and finally, Rai Begum Shah Nawez, a female Muslim League politician and member of the National Defense Council. "Between the five there are two things in common," Delhi's *National Call* hooted derisively. "They do not represent any group of men in this country, and they can all speak very well if they are appropriately briefed, on any subject."[31] For Linlithgow, however, the decision represented a way to avoid a controversial matter.

The selection of the Indian group by Mudaliar stirred dissent not only in the nationalist community, but also within the Indian Institute itself. Some pointed out that the Indian group was appointed by Mudaliar personally, not through the Institute, and that the group included figures who were not even members of the IIIA. One of the most vociferous opponents of the selection process was Dr. H.N. Kunzru, a Liberal politician and member of the Indian Institute's governing council. The Indian Institute was never

[30] This characterization was used by George R. Merrell, a State Department officer traveling with Louis A. Johnson, President Franklin D. Roosevelt's personal representative in India, who passed along the news of the negative Indian reaction to his superiors in Washington. Merrell to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Nov. 10, 1942, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/185, NARA.
[31] Editorial, "Pacific Delegation," *National Call* (Delhi), Oct. 28, 1942.

consulted on the subject of the IPR delegation, Kunzru insisted in a public statement he issued November 3, 1942, and therefore all those chosen must be considered as the "personal nominees" of Mudaliar. Kunzru proceeded to lament the fact that the composition of the delegation meant Indians would only provide an official point of view, which ran counter to the ideals of the IPR as well as the Indian Institute's own constitution, which barred the group from disseminating governmental propaganda. "Any delegation from India should consist predominantly of non-officials and be led by a non-official Indian," Kunzru complained.[32] Because of the "irregular and autocratic" methods employed by Mudaliar and the resulting "great injury" to the reputation of the Institute, Kunzru announced a protest movement against the selection of the delegates. Although he and his fellow dissenters did not succeed in changing the members of the Indian group at the conference, Kunzru made clear that many Indian intellectuals preferred to be represented by more independent voices on the world stage.

British leaders were understandably pleased with the final selection of the Indian group for the 1942 international IPR conference in Canada.[33] What had first promised to be a public relations nightmare for them now had distinctly rosier prospects. The British, to be sure, were unhappy that Carter had put India and Burma on the agenda for the 1942 conference; after all, they had never before been considered "Pacific" concerns, and the British preferred to keep such matters internal to the empire and thereby avoid public debate.[34] Moreover, they were deeply suspicious of Carter's Indian "friends" in the

[32] H.N. Kunzru statement to press, "India and the Institute of Pacific Relations Conference," Nov. 3, 1942, transcribed in Rockefeller Foundation files, Record Group 1.1, Series 200, Box 356, Folder 4232, RAC.

[33] For a full report on the conference proceedings, see Institute of Pacific Relations, *War and Peace in the Pacific: Preliminary Report of the Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations on Wartime and Post-war Cooperation of the United Nations in the Pacific and the Far East, Mount Tremblant, Quebec, December 4-14, 1942* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943).

[34] Margaret Cleeve of Chatham House explained to W.J. Hinton of the Foreign Office that they considered protesting the inclusion of Indian topics at the conference from a constitutional point of view, but decided against it: "The IPR Committee thrashed the whole problem out at length and finally decided that it was better to face the fact that the Americans at the IPR Conference, and possibly the Canadians, intended as

Congress party. As Chatham House staffer Margaret Cleeve bluntly put it, Carter's approach to India "is distinctly detached—from British interests."[35] But when they heard about the friendly delegation assembled by Mudaliar, they grew considerably more amenable. Once in Quebec, the British delegates watched with amusement as Mudaliar and his fellow Indians urged restraint and moderation regarding Indian independence at the IPR roundtable discussions. "Ramaswami and his Indian lot were, I think, the prize turn," Sir Frederick Whyte gushed to Cleeve a week after the conference ended, praising Mudaliar's "patience and realism," the "feminine performance" of Rai Begum Shah Nawez, and even the "vigorous" contribution of the aging Zafrulla Khan.[36] The British had endured some sharp questioning at the conference, but they felt confident that they and the Indians had presented a strong defense of imperial policies.

Carter was no doubt disappointed with the Indian group's fidelity to British control, but the 1942 conference succeeded in putting India on the IPR agenda, where it would remain a central concern for the organization. Furthermore, Indian involvement in the IPR publicized the fact that Indians were beginning to think of themselves as future regional powers in their own right, as evidenced by Panikkar's data paper on the regional development of Southeast Asia.[37] With Indian intellectuals now engaged in the Pacific region, the IPR's governing Pacific Council voted to amend the Institute's constitution to allow India to put a group forward as a potential national council in its own right, and not simply be involved as unofficial observers. Carter leaped into action, organizing a small IPR conference on India in the war effort in Princeton, New Jersey one weekend in April

was shown by their tentative agenda to discuss India and that the bolder course was to show no disinclination to do so in the hope that the discussion might do some good." Cleeve to Hinton, Aug. 10, 1942, in CHA 6/4/55, RIIA.

[35] Margaret Cleeve to W.J. Hinton, *Ibid*.

[36] Sir Frederick Whyte to Margaret Cleeve, Dec. 22, 1942, in CHA 6/4/55, RIIA.

[37] Panikkar, *The Future of South-East Asia: An Indian View*, pp. 13-25.

1943.[38] One of the principal conclusions from the gathering was that the United States was sorely lacking in information on India, and that a non-partisan organization like the Institute of Pacific Relations was well-situated to embark on such a project.[39] After the meeting, Carter coolly wrote to his British colleagues regarding his intentions: "As our contacts with India multiply, which we hope they will, we will endeavor to keep you informed."[40] British observers could only wring their hands. W.J. Hinton, an official with the Foreign Office working at the wartime office for the British Information Service in New York City, attended the Princeton conference and reported to Chatham House that he regarded Carter's initiative as "dangerous," inasmuch as Hinton had "little confidence in the impartiality of the IPR research."[41] Yet there was very little the British could do: India had now been moved into the province of the Pacific internationalists in the IPR.

Within the next few months, Carter helped usher in a brand new Indian organization for the study of world affairs. During a visit to India in September 1943, Carter met with dissidents from the Indian Institute of International Affairs, including H.R. Kunzru. The Indian leader told Carter that they were prepared to form a new organization—the Indian Council of World Affairs—and were interested in the possibility of affiliating with the IPR. Upon hearing of these meetings, a Government of India officer from the External Affairs Department, Hugh Weightman, called Carter into his office and berated the IPR secretary-general for meeting with Kunzru and interfering in internal Indian matters. Weightman alleged that Kunzru was manipulating the IPR to create a schism among Indian intellectuals, and that his breakaway group "could not

[38] Institute of Pacific Relations Conference on the United Nations' War Effort, April 17-18, 1943, in Box 183, "Edward Carter," Pacific Relations, COL.
[39] W. Norman Brown, "Suggested Program to Promote the Study of India in the United States," Private IPR Round Table, April 18, 1943, in Box 183, "Edward Carter," Pacific Relations, COL.
[40] Edward C. Carter to Ivison Macadam, June 8, 1943, in CHA 6/5/57, RIIA.
[41] W.J. Hinton to George Sansom, May 24, 1943, in CHA 6/5/57, RIIA.

succeed."[42] The Government of India clearly saw the threat of a new organization where members were dedicated to an independent Indian view of foreign affairs, distinct from the British imperial perspective. Weightman's intimidating tactics, however, were ineffective. Within weeks, Kunzru and other dissidents established the Indian Council of World Affairs, boldly severing ties between Indian intellectuals and Chatham House. A new era in the study of Indian international affairs had begun.

WARTIME CHINA AND THE IPR

If the political situation in India made Edward Carter's initiatives sensitive, they were doubly so for China. In India, Carter merely had to usher in a new organization in the face of British reluctance. But in China, the IPR secretary-general faced the problem of maintaining good relations with an existing Chinese IPR council, which was itself confronting a double threat: war with Japan and a growing communist insurgency. The Chinese council had close ties with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the nationalist leader of China's Kuomintang party. Western IPR leaders had close ties with Chiang as well. Early in the war, *Pacific Affairs* editor Owen Lattimore left his position to serve as President Roosevelt's personal representative to Chiang (1941-42).[43] Research Secretary William Holland, meanwhile, took a temporary leave of absence from the IPR late in the war to serve as the director of the Office of War Information (OWI) in Chungking, where Chiang and his wife based their headquarters. But these close ties did not mean uncritical acceptance of the nationalist leader. During the war, many China observers became frustrated with corruption surrounding Chiang and his failure to rally his countrymen

---

[42] Edward C. Carter, Memorandum, Sept. 23, 1943, in Box 66, "Edward Carter—personal," Pacific Relations, COL.

[43] For a posthumously published work on Lattimore's impressions of Chiang, see Owen Lattimore with Fujiko Isono, *China Memoirs: Chiang Kai-shek and the War Against Japan* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1990).

against the Japanese. Opposition to Chiang manifested itself in the increasing popularity of the Chinese Communist party led by Mao Tse-tung. By then, many of the IPR's administrators and writers began to view Chiang as an impediment rather than a conduit for a "true new order" in China, and thus they plunged headlong into the political brambles of an incipient Chinese civil war.

Bringing about a new order in China meant not only winning the war against Japan and keeping the country united but also mitigating the impact of Western financial penetration of the country. For decades, many in China seethed over extraterritoriality zones exempting Westerners from Chinese laws, and condemned "imperialists" who were fleecing the Chinese people and government through extractive loan agreements. The editors of the IPR journal *Pacific Affairs* made an effort to include these critical assessments of Western economic presence in China. As early as 1929, for instance, the magazine published a translation of an article by Hu Heng Sin, "Foreign Economic Domination of China," that originally appeared in *Eastern Miscellany*. "The imperialists and the politicians do not consider the Chinese State as a state, but as a great market," Hu wrote. "The Chinese nation they regard not as a nation, but as a great body of consumers."[44] One year later, an article by Chang Yun-Yo, "American Imperialism: A Chinese View," was even more precise in its condemnation of open-door trade policies that overwhelmingly benefited the United States.[45] Such expressions were shared among most Chinese at the time, regardless of their affiliation to the "nationalist" or "communist" cause.

---

44 Hu Heng Sin, "Foreign Economic Domination in China," *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 2, No. 11 (Nov. 1929): 707-714.

45 Chang Yun-Yo, "American Imperialism: A Chinese View," *Pacific Affairs,* Vol. 3, No. 3 (March 1930): 278-284.

Although the sense of victimhood was common among the Chinese people during the interwar years, Chinese delegates at IPR conferences were relatively diplomatic and courteous towards Western colleagues. In addition to Hu Shih, China's leading public intellectual who would later serve as Chinese Ambassador to the United States during World War II, other distinguished Chinese conference delegates in the 1930s included W.W. Yen, the former prime minister and former Chinese ambassador to the United States and Soviet Union; and K.P. Chen, the general manager of Shanghai's Commercial and Savings Bank. These figures all had strong ties with the United States and were generally pro-Western in their perspectives. As tension escalated with Japan, they were even more inclined to cultivate American concern for China. The IPR served as an important international forum for Chinese intellectual figures to make a case for the defense of China against the aggression of the Japan. With the decision by the Japanese council to remove itself from IPR activities altogether in early 1941, the Chinese IPR council became the primary institutional link between Western scholars and Asia.

As much as the Chinese council wished to project a single voice to the West, it was clear by the late 1930s that China was deeply divided politically. Mao's Chinese Communists had broken from the Kuomintang party and launched a grassroots revolutionary movement to take control of China. With the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War, communists and nationalists formally put away their differences and agreed to create a "united front" against the Japanese. But this partnership proved to be a mirage, as Chiang and Mao continued to siphon away fighting resources in order to consolidate domestic political advantages. As leader of the Kuomintang party with supposed control of the Chinese government, Chiang was the recipient of $500 million in Western economic aid and a fleet of American fighter planes in the war against Japan. Chiang's government also had an enormous investment in projecting the sense abroad

that they were the rightful rulers of a unified country. Close observers of China, however, recognized that the country was far less united than the nationalists portrayed. Hanson Baldwin, foreign correspondent for *The New York Times*, wrote an article for *Reader's Digest* in 1943 that called "China" more of a geographer's expression than a modern nation.[46] Chiang's nationalist supporters vehemently objected to such frank assessments as hurtful to their wartime efforts to consolidate power.

Pacific internationalists in the IPR agreed with the American government that uniting China was not only a valuable wartime strategy but also a critical component of nurturing a stable and democratic country at the end of the war. But to deny the existence of a powerful communist movement was wishful thinking. Furthermore, IPR writers increasingly noticed that the wartime actions of Chiang—threatening to postpone constitutional reforms and eliminating political enemies by force—increasingly made the Chinese Nationalists look more like the forces of repression rather than liberation. Institute publications, especially in the United States, expressed this frustration with Chiang in no uncertain terms. T.A. Bisson, an American expert on U.S. policies in Asia, wrote an article for the July 1943 issue of the American IPR journal *Far Eastern Survey* in which he advanced a "Two China" thesis. One China, Bisson claimed, was "feudal," and was represented by the Kuomintang party inasmuch as it had done little to overturn landlord-tenant relationships or provide greater political reforms and civil liberties to its people.[47] The other China, Bisson continued, was "democratic," and was represented by the "so-called" Communist party inasmuch as its land reforms had freed peasants from the weight of rent, taxes and interest. Bisson concluded that the Kuomintang leadership's failure to challenge the basic tenets of the feudal system was the principal obstacle to the

---

[46] Hanson Baldwin, "Too Much Wishful Thinking About China," *Reader's Digest* (Aug. 1943), 63-67.
[47] T.A. Bisson, *American Policy in the Far East, 1931-1941* (New York: International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941).

unification of China under democratic principles and an impediment to the country's full wartime mobilization.[48] Widely reprinted in China, Bisson's article was decried by the Nationalists as an outrageous attack, and later would be used as evidence of bias during the U.S. Senate investigation of the Institute. The article nevertheless quietly earned the respect of some American diplomatic officials serving in China. Chinese sensitivity to American public opinion was such that critical expressions, these officials hoped, could serve to push Chiang's party toward greater reforms.[49]

Concern about Chiang's government in the summer of 1943 brought IPR Secretary-General Edward Carter into action as an unofficial envoy for the United States while simultaneously giving him an opportunity to advance his international work on behalf of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The ostensible reason for the trip was a humanitarian crisis. The anti-American Chinese Minister of Education was systematically cutting financial support and even rice rations for scholars who disagreed with him, and American officials determined that some 300 Chinese professors were in need of help.[50] The minister had gone so far as to reject aid from United China Relief, on whose board Carter sat. President Franklin Roosevelt's economic adviser Lauchlin Currie, who had previously served as Roosevelt's personal representative to China and knew Carter and the IPR, called Carter to the White House and asked him if he might meet with Chiang Kai-shek and assess the situation.[51] Carter readily accepted, and upon securing permission from the highest levels of the Chinese and American governments,

---

[48] T.A. Bisson, "China's Part in a Coalition War," *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 12, No. 14 (July 14, 1943): 134-141.
[49] John K. Fairbank to T.A. Bisson, Sept. 19, 1943, in U.S. Senate, *Hearings Before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1952), 3800-3804.
[50] The White House meeting was recounted by Carter in an interview with Rockefeller Foundation officials. Interview, May 17, 1943, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 356, Folder 4233, RAC.
[51] Owen Lattimore had departed as Chiang's personal adviser in December 1942.

he obtained free travel aboard military aircraft and high-priority seats for himself as well as IPR Research Secretary William L. Holland.[52]

Carter and Holland's 1943 trip to Asia may have been funded by the U.S. government, but it primarily served as a means to conduct international IPR work. By the time Carter reached Chungking, the crisis over the scholars had ended, and thus the hour-long meeting between Carter, Holland, Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek passed without any awkwardness. Carter made no mention of American concerns about the Generalissimo's leadership, nor did Chiang make any mention of the recent Bisson article that had caused such grumbling within the Nationalist government. For his part, the Generalissimo made it abundantly clear that he was interested in the IPR's research agenda, even going so far as to suggest subjects about which he wished the Chinese council would study and write.[53] Chiang also saw Carter as someone who could provide insight into the whole Asian situation, and grilled him with questions about American attitudes toward Korea and India. On the latter subject, Carter candidly told Chiang that the heavy-handed British repression of Indian nationalists was effective only as a short-term solution and was in danger of breaking down at any time. Chiang, whose sympathy with Indian nationalism was well known, asked Carter to repeat his statement to British Prime Minister Winston Churchill the next time Carter saw him.[54] Carter made

---

[52] Stanley K. Hornbeck, now the State Department's political relations adviser, reported that the trip was co-sponsored by Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles and Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs T.V. Soong. Years later, Holland marveled at the ability of Carter to secure such high-priority passage: "It was a strange trip because we stopped almost every night at military bases and ate in military messes, but we met all sorts of interesting people. Each morning we had to go to the operations office to find out whether we were going to be able to travel that particular day, a decision dependent upon the number of planes available and the priority we had been given. We both had fairly high priorities – 'number two' – so we went a good deal faster than many others. Some had to sit for weeks in various isolated airfields waiting for their number to come up." Paul F. Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations: The Memoirs of William L. Holland* (Tokyo: Ryukei shosha, 1995), 28.

[53] Brooks Atkinson, "Research Experts at Work in China," *New York Times*, Sept. 7, 1943.

[54] George Atcheson, Jr., Charge d'affaires, Chungking, "Memorandum of Conversation," Aug. 27, 1943, to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/210, NARA.

clear during his meeting with Chiang that he did not speak on behalf of the U.S. government; perhaps for this very reason the Generalissimo found him to be a trusted international contact.

Carter's visit to Chungking revealed his proximity to the halls of power, yet it also demonstrated his fraught relationship with top American diplomats in Washington. The IPR secretary-general received travel support every step of the way, often with directives from Secretary of State Cordell Hull himself. When he and Holland arrived at the American embassy in Chungking, they stayed with George Atcheson, the charge d'affaires. But American officials continued to be circumspect toward the IPR secretary-general, an approach urged by the State Department's Stanley Hornbeck even before the war. When Atcheson reported to Hull that Carter and Holland were interested in knowing more about the communist situation in China, Hull quickly responded that they should be kept in the dark. "[T]he less discussion there is currently of Kuomintang-Communist difficulties and problems the better," the Secretary of State curtly informed Embassy officials.[55] American diplomats recognized that Carter was not one of them, even if he often acted as a roving ambassador. Carter could be a useful supplier of information, yet he was not beholden to the American government or its policies.[56] Supplying Carter with a candid appraisal of the communist situation in China would only complicate the American effort to portray China as united in the defense of its country.

[55] Cordell Hull to American Embassy, Chungking, Aug. 25, 1943, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/198, NARA.

[56] In his conversation with Chiang Kai-shek, the IPR secretary-general was not inclined to stay "on-message" regarding U.S. policies or restrict his personal opinion. In discussing Korea, for instance, Carter told the Generalissimo that some Americans were open to giving Korea "semi-independent" status under China's protection—a position that no one in the State Department had even heard of, much less endorsed. The gaffe was of no great consequence; Chiang quickly assured Carter that he supported full independence for Korea. Joseph W. Ballantine, Memorandum, Oct. 9, 1943, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/210, NARA.

While mid-level American diplomats in China—the so-called "China Hands"—continued to recognize the value of the IPR's work in giving an independent assessment of the Chinese situation, they too worried that such frankness might hurt Chinese-American wartime relations. In early 1944, the American council of the IPR produced a draft manuscript of a pamphlet, "Wartime China," by the American writer Maxwell Stewart, intended to give U.S. readers a primer on China's achievements and setbacks in the war effort, as well as a short treatise on the political divisions in the country.[57] As a courtesy, American IPR officials circulated the draft among American officials, including John K. Fairbank, the Harvard Sinologist who was then head of the American Publication Service at the U.S. embassy in Chungking. The previous summer Fairbank had written some self-confessed "fan mail" to T.A. Bisson over his article in *Far Eastern Survey*.[58] Upon seeing Stewart's manuscript making similar criticisms of the nationalists, Fairbank did not raise any objections to the content so much as to the tone. No doubt remembering the outrage to Bisson's article, Fairbank urged the editor of the pamphlet series, American IPR staffer Miriam Farley, to soften some language so as not to create another Chinese-American contretemps.[59] Fairbank even raised the specter of fallout between the Chinese council and the international IPR. In the end, Farley encouraged Stewart to make a few stylistic changes, but the essential substance remained. "I felt that a sound relationship between China and America could not in the long run be based on concealment of facts from the American public," Farley wrote Fairbank years later, "and

---

[57] "War-time China" was part of a larger series of popular pamphlets published by the American council of the Institute of Pacific Relations intended for American students as well as soldiers to give them a better picture of the war in the Pacific. Demand for these pamphlets grew dramatically during the war; some two million copies were produced on topics from problems in the Philippines to trade rivalries in the Pacific. Hooper, ed., *Memoirs of William L. Holland*, pp. 86-87.

[58] John K. Fairbank to T.A. Bisson, Sept. 19, 1943, quoted in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings*, pp. 3800-3804.

[59] Miriam S. Farley to William L. Holland, Feb. 4, 1944, quoted in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings*, p. 3796.

that it was better for the American public to learn the facts from China's friends than from her enemies."[60] The pamphlet was published in April 1944, and while the Chinese IPR objected, they remained an active council in the IPR.

In pressing for a new order in the Pacific, the American IPR pamphlet series at times stepped on the toes not only of China but also of other wartime allies. The 1944 publication of *Our Job in the Pacific* was a case in point. In early 1944, Owen Lattimore approached Henry Wallace, then vice president of the United States, and urged him to set down his ideas about the postwar world, and then enlisted Lattimore's wife, Eleanor, to help Wallace write the pamphlet under the auspices of the American IPR.[61] Wallace, who was friendly with the Lattimores and would later serve as an Institute trustee after the war, had a reputation as a committed left-leaning liberal, and the manuscript reflected his strong belief in the breakup of the European colonial empires. The pamphlet proposed the creation of a "Free Asia," consisting of "all China and Soviet Asia, which form a great area of freedom, potentially a 'freedom bloc'."[62] In his diary, Wallace noted that he showed a complete draft to John Carter Vincent, then chief of the State Department's Division of Chinese Affairs, who did not see "any reason" why other diplomats might complain about its contents.[63] But Wallace and the IPR underestimated the impact his words could have, especially on the British, who were by then desperate to dampen American wartime anti-colonialism. Lord Halifax, British ambassador to the United States, protested directly to Secretary of State Hull about Wallace's "regrettable"

---

[60] Miriam S. Farley to John K. Fairbank, Feb. 19, 1952, quoted in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings,* p. 3797.

[61] *Ibid.,* pp. 950-954. Also see Memorandum: "Our Job in the Pacific," Oct. 6, 1951, in Box 10, Folder 1, Carter papers, UVM.

[62] Henry A. Wallace, *Our Job in the Pacific* (New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1944), p. 28.

[63] John Morton Blum, ed., *The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 329.

comments, while other British diplomats joined an effort to push the liberal Wallace off the presidential ticket that fall, a movement that eventually proved successful.[64]

In the coming years, the Institute of Pacific Relations would come under heavy scrutiny for the communist "line" it supposedly took during the war and the Institute's alleged attempts to infiltrate the American diplomatic corps. The evidence points to a far different conclusion. Edward Carter's contacts in China were heavily weighted to nationalists in the Chinese IPR council and to their leader Chiang Kai-shek. Carter's interests were first and foremost in Asian regionalism and the promotion of a post-imperial world order. State Department officials, particularly those in Washington, worked with Carter, but continued to regard him as an outsider. American IPR publications, such as those by Stewart and Wallace, were lauded by American officials as honest if not the most delicate assessments of the region's problems. Diplomatic officials and American IPR writers alike were searching for a "true new order" in China, but the former were far more willing to suppress concerns about their allies during the war. Such reaction was understandable, yet it did nothing to advance American public awareness, especially regarding the Chinese situation. Looking back in the wake of the 1949 Communist revolution, John K. Fairbank noted that far from giving aid and comfort to Chinese Communists, a pamphlet such as Stewart's managed to give a rare understanding

[64] The British actually received an advance copy of *Our Job in the Pacific* through an intriguing set of circumstances. A young British secret service agent, Roald Dahl (who would later become a celebrated children's author) was stationed in Washington, D.C. and befriended Wallace. Dahl saw a draft copy of the pamphlet at a social gathering at the Washington home of Charles Marsh, a Texas newspaper publisher. Recognizing its incendiary contents, Dahl secretly called over to the British Security Coordination offices, and arranged for a contact to pick up the draft pamphlet, have it photocopied, and returned to Dahl at Marsh's house, all within 15 minutes. According to Wallace's biographers the pamphlet continued its fast travels: "From Washington the manuscript was routed to New York, where Sir William Stephenson ran Britain's secret service operations in the United States. Then it crossed the Atlantic and was given to 'C' – code name for Sir Stewart Graham Menzies, Britain's wartime spymaster. Menzies took it to Winston Churchill. The document's call for liberation of colonial peoples in Asia 'stirred Winston to cataclysms of wrath,' according to one observer. Soon British agents were busily gathering information on the Institute of Pacific Relations, the background of [John Carter] Vincent and [Owen] Lattimore …" John C. Culver and John Hyde, *American Dreamer: The Life and Times of Henry A. Wallace* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2000), p. 353.

of the "realities" of wartime China. "This is something that lies behind our disaster in China," Fairbank told his questioners at a 1952 Senate subcommittee hearing to investigate the IPR's role in the "loss" of China to communism. "The fact that we did not really know what was going on, and we did not make the effort we could have made for reform programs in China before it was too late."[65] The IPR's program may have been diplomatically embarrassing and politically dangerous, but such were the byproducts of the debate over the future of the Pacific.

The end of World War II did not usher in the "new world order" that many in the IPR had envisioned at the beginning of the war. European imperialism had not died; in many ways, it had visions of reconstituting itself in the postwar period. Asians themselves, meanwhile, were divided over what would constitute the best new regional order. But by addressing these questions, Carter's IPR situated itself as a critical forum where Asian and Western intellectuals could wrestle with these large questions. It was not a perfectly representative body, of course—internal political disputes as well as continued imperial imperatives restricted the international body's membership and activities. But the IPR provided at least one important answer to the rise of Asian nationalism during the war. Anti-colonial sentiment had indeed exploded in strength during World War II. Left untended, it had the capacity to revert into a broad anti-Western movement—a version of the Japanese slogan to leave "Asia to the Asiatics." By harnessing the power of a nascent Asian nationalism rather than denying it, Edward Carter and other IPR leaders were successful in bringing them into conversation with Western powers—an internationalist mission that would continue for the next several years.

---

[65] John K. Fairbank testimony in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings,* p. 3800.

Chapter Three

Internationalism in Flux: Europe and the IPR, 1945-1947

The years immediately surrounding the conclusion of World War II are regarded as a "liberal moment," a time in which the postwar international order became fixed for the next several decades.[1] Yet the kind of liberal internationalism that this moment engendered was not the kind that Edward Carter and his fellow Pacific internationalists envisioned at the beginning of the war. Although the Allies had won the war and were in the process of establishing numerous economic and collective security measures (the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) to insure postwar stability, these international institutions increasingly were geared around the specific goals of extending capitalism and defending the West from communist aggression.[2] While continuing to mouth the democratic ideals enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, the United States led the way in creating a new global order under the wing of an American "preponderance of power" in military and economic might to combat the Soviet Union in the Cold War.[3]

This chapter examines the way in which Pacific internationalists made often uncomfortable adjustments to the postwar era. Within the United States, a growing concern about communism circumscribed the debate about Pacific matters at IPR meetings. Any attitude that deviated from an acceptance of U.S. policies regarding containment became suspicious in the eyes of State Department observers and supporters

---

[1] Robert Latham, *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).
[2] Elizabeth Edwards Spalding, *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006), pp. 1-35.
[3] Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1993).

of Nationalist China. European IPR members, sensing American uncertainty, found an opening to gain greater control over the most prominent Asian scholarly organization in the world, and thereby curtail its anti-colonial agenda. Eager to internationalize the Institute's work and to distance itself from charges of communist bias, American IPR leaders accepted the European councils' demands to reform the international secretariat, including the removal of Edward Carter, the outspoken secretary-general. During the tenth international IPR conference in Stratford-on-Avon, England, in September 1947, newly energized European members reasserted their vision of a disinterested, unofficial, non-politicized Asian organization—one that, importantly, would refrain from attacking their imperial policies. Despite the preponderance of American power in the Pacific region and within the Institute of Pacific Relations, Europeans were largely successful in their effort to quash imperial criticism in the immediate postwar era.[4]

Pacific internationalists in the IPR's New York secretariat believed it was important to disassociate themselves from governmental policies. As an international private organization, the IPR provided a forum in which elites from several countries could research and debate issues outside the purview of the nation-state. Some top leaders at the IPR, including Secretary-General Edward Carter, worked to reclaim this transnational role for the Institute. To achieve this broad vision, however, required a conscientious rejection of the nationalism exacerbated by the war years, in which quasi-official delegations at IPR conferences bickered over the foreign policy objectives of their respective countries. Such nationalism, however, was a particularly intractable opponent at the end of the war. Harriet Moore, a staff worker in the IPR's international office, wrote to Carter about her feelings of discouragement: "Unless they [the national

[4] This analysis tracks with recent studies that have showed that European governments sometimes held the initiative regarding the development of Cold War policies adopted in the United States. See especially Mark Atwood Lawrence, *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

councils] return to greater tolerance, greater intellectual freedom and greater social curiosity I have little hope for the IPR."[5] Moore, like Carter, was advocating that the IPR encourage an internationalist sensibility, and not simply be a forum in which national interests were debated.

The irony for Pacific internationalists in the aftermath of World War II was that they had succeeded almost too well in promoting regional sensibilities. Carter's trips to Asia during the war encouraged collaboration among intellectuals in India and China. But with the challenges to imperialism in ascendance, European councils now found themselves willing to enter into unofficial alliances as well. By 1945, British, French and Dutch members of the IPR found common cause in defending their colonial policies. Evidence from British and French archives suggests, moreover, that this informal collaboration extended to sharing information with their respective governments—even as European officials denied such contact with their counterparts in Washington. In banding together, the Europeans were able to show that the impulse toward internationalism could cut in more conservative directions. With an American council increasingly uncertain about its place within the new global climate, Europe now took the lead in defining postwar intellectual ties to Asia.

COMMUNISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The end of the war was the high-water mark for Pacific internationalists in the United States. The Institute of Pacific Relations was recognized by both the American diplomatic and military communities for its wartime services in research on the Asia-Pacific region, and some government agencies sought to keep the IPR as collaborators

[5] Harriet Moore to Carter, August 14, 1945, in Box 7, Folder 12, Edward C. Carter papers, University of Vermont archives (UVM), Burlington.

after the war. The State Department's Division of Cultural Relations, for instance, approached the American IPR in 1944 about possible "guidance" on postwar projects on educational planning in Japan and China. Officials meeting with IPR leaders held out the carrot that as a government-affiliated private organization, it "would be in a very excellent position to exercise some influence upon eventual policy."[6] Other officials, however, recognized the importance of a truly independent organization such as the IPR in serving as an unofficial link between West and East. Charles B. Fahs, chief of the Far Eastern Division of the Office of Strategic Services, spent some time with the IPR's Bay Area office while he was in San Francisco for the United Nations charter conference in April 1945. Upon his return to the East Coast, Fahs reported that he was "more impressed than ever before with the value of the IPR in making possible informal contacts between Americans and persons of other nationalities interested in international relations."[7] Fahs strongly believed that U.S. national interests were being served by the independent work of the American council of the IPR, and called for a continuation of the close alliance between government officials and the private research institute.[8]

---

[6] Dr. Ralph Turner, the Yale historian who had taken up work for the State Department during the war, asked the IPR to put together a conference for private experts and governmental officials on postwar educational planning in Asia. The American IPR chairman, Raymond Dennett, accepting the proposal, said the group "could hardly do otherwise." Memorandum of Conversation between Mr. Ralph Turner, Mr. Haldore Hansen, Mrs. Wilma Fairbank and Mr. Raymond Dennett, Feb. 12, 1944; and memorandum of conversation between Mr. Ralph Turner and Mr. Raymond Dennett, Feb. 17, 1944, in Box 191, "Division of Cultural Relations," Pacific Relations, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

[7] Fahs to David Stephens, June 11, 1945, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 351, Folder 4185, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.

[8] The IPR's value to the government was greater *because* of its private status, in many cases. In the spring of 1945, two prominent State Department officials, Alger Hiss and John Carter Vincent, extended an invitation to I.P.R. personnel to advise Americans in attendance at the United Nations charter conference in San Francisco. The State Department did not make similar official invitations to other non-governmental groups, but made an exception because, in the recollection of the American chairman of the IPR, Raymond Dennett, the Institute "was not a pressure group and did not have any particular axes to grind." Dennett to Admiral John W. Greenslade, March 5, 1945, cited in Raymond Dennett testimony, U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings*, p. 2138.

The American IPR's rising stature among US officials presented a conundrum for the private group. It was clear that the postwar IPR did not wish to be seen as an agent of the U.S. government. IPR officials maintained that they should not seek to create or even reflect particular national policies, but simply to represent its diverse community of experts—scholars, businessmen, and journalists. American IPR leaders thus sought to distance themselves from U.S. policymakers in the interests of both expediency and principle. They continued to accept solicitations for governmental research projects, and maintained close ties with various agencies, but they also worked to reclaim the IPR's identity and value as a private, independent research organization beholden to no outside party.[9] More broadly, leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations took pains to emphasize that the American Institute was only one national council within a larger international structure. Institute leaders stressed their unique position as a private bridge between European, American and Asian elites. Close contact with American officials had provided a sense of short-term influence, but it undermined the IPR's scholarly stature and its long-term efforts to serve as a neutral forum for its international membership.

Accusations during the war did even more to undermine the Institute's objectivity. In November 1944, Alfred Kohlberg, an American IPR member and owner of a Chinese textile manufacturing business, circulated a letter to top IPR officials claiming that the Institute had been infiltrated by Communist party supporters. A fervent supporter of the Nationalist Chinese cause, Kohlberg assembled an 88-page document that purported to show evidence of pro-communist bias in several wartime IPR publications, which had been used in military orientation camps and schools around the United States. He

[9] In the fall of 1945, U.S. officials interested in Far Eastern research approached Raymond Dennett about an ambitious plan for IPR group research in Japan for a period of five years, involving up to a dozen people, but there is no evidence that this proposal actually went forward. Dennett to Percy Corbett, Sept. 24, 1945, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 351, Folder 4186, RAC.

especially targeted Maxwell Stewart's pamphlet *Wartime China*, from which he selectively quoted and concluded that "from start to finish [it was] a deliberate smear of China and the Chinese government." Kohlberg charged that Stewart, T.A. Bisson and other IPR staff writers were "unpatriotic, biased, uninformed and incompetent," and filed a court action to track down the names and addresses of all American members. Kohlberg was not involved in the Institute's administration, and had a long-standing reputation as a troublemaker, but his vocal charges dealt a blow to a group whose reputation rested on its impartiality. Edward Carter, the IPR secretary-general, prepared an analysis of Kohlberg's charges a few months later, dismissing them as "irresponsible" and "reckless."[10] Kohlberg nevertheless continued his public campaign over the next two years to ferret out supposed Communists in the IPR, taking aim at targets such as Frederick Vanderbilt Field. In April 1947, American IPR members finally exonerated the Institute's leadership with an overwhelming vote of confidence. At least for a time, the charges of communist bias were put to rest.[11]

Kohlberg's charges alone may not have shaken the confidence in the IPR's American council, but they came at a time of transition in the life of the organization as well as in the world at large. The Rockefeller Foundation, the largest single financial supporter of the IPR, announced in the spring of 1945 that it was planning to taper its subsidies of independent research institutes dealing with international relations in general, and instead contribute greater resources to university-based programs focusing on subjects of particular "strategic importance." Joseph Willits, the Rockefeller Foundation's social sciences division head, questioned whether "adult education" bodies like the IPR, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Foreign Policy Association "want

---

[10] Edward Carter, "An Analysis of Mr. Alfred E. Kohlberg's Charges Against the Institute of Pacific Relations," Feb. 1945, in Box 7, Folder 13, Carter papers, UVM.

[11] Nate White, "Officials of Pacific Institute Cleared of Communist Taint," *Christian Science Monitor*, April 23, 1947.

RF to go on relieving their budgetary situation indefinitely."[12] The Kohlberg controversy only increased the critical scrutiny by Rockefeller officials. Willits believed IPR officials when they characterized Kohlberg as "something of a meat-axe," but that did not mean the American council was completely innocent of the charges of bias: "In fact," Willits confided, "I do not think it is." Foundation officials considered the impact of a complete and immediate cessation of funds on the IPR, and determined that such a move would doom the organization. A decision had to be made, Willis believed, whether the IPR should be "killed or purified." Rockefeller Foundation officials decided "it would be the wiser course to preserve and cleanse it," and approved a five-year terminating grant to the IPR that would carry the Institute through the rest of the decade.[13] The IPR had been spared a death sentence, but American members had been put on notice that their financial backers were no longer willing to issue *carte blanche* support.

The American council in 1945 was forced to deal with another kind of internal crisis, in the form of a regional revolt by the West Coast branches of the IPR. Ever since the American and international offices of the IPR moved to New York in 1933, West Coast IPR members had felt underappreciated and overlooked. With the emergence of Kohlberg, criticism of the New York office burst out into the open. West Coast branches largely defended IPR leaders from Kohlberg's charges, but they pointed out that such charges could have been avoided with greater oversight from the New York leadership. The Seattle regional office, for example, complained to Rockefeller Foundation officials that unless IPR management became more democratic, "there was little reason to continue affiliation."[14] Critics in the San Francisco office put their concerns into more

---

[12] Joseph H. Willits, "Postwar Policy in the Support of International Relations," May 1945, in RF files, RG 3, Series 910, Box 8, Folder 67, RAC.

[13]Willits, Memo to Board of Trustees, Rockefeller Foundation, April 1946, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4237, RAC.

[14] Edward W. Allen to Roger F. Evans, Feb. 15, 1945, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357. Folder 4235, RAC.

personal terms. Secretary-General Edward Carter's leadership, one executive officer complained, was marked by extreme arrogance. "I acknowledge his abilities," the officer wrote, "but do not believe in dictatorship."[15] Bay Area members demanded that the American headquarters be moved to San Francisco; New York officials protested, saying that the Californians had shown very little interest in supporting the national or international IPR programs.[16] The crisis soon passed, but the underlying tension remained. The American council was still the largest and wealthiest in the IPR, but it was far from the most unified.

"I can't yet make up my mind whether the American Council is suffering from growing pains or death pangs," one concerned government professor confessed to Philip C. Jessup, the prominent scholar-diplomat and senior IPR leader, in the wake of Kohlberg's allegations.[17] Asian scholars in the American IPR were indeed on the defensive after World War II, only a few months after being praised effusively by fellow specialists inside and outside the corridors of power. Much of this concern was a result of the rapid change in international climate brought on by the emergence of the Cold War. Liberal internationalists of the IPR variety were seen by some as a vestige of the Roosevelt era—naïve to the cold realities of the emerging strategic necessities of Great Power politics. Kohlberg's charges of communist infiltration in the American IPR threw into stark relief the changed political landscape of the postwar era. American IPR leaders sought to maintain their independence from the American foreign policy establishment in the postwar world as a way to heighten their value as a scholarly resource. Instead, they found themselves attacked from within and marginalized by former allies. For those who

---

[15] Emma McLaughlin to Philip Jessup, Nov. 29, 1945, in Box A124, "IPR American Council – General, 1945-46," Philip C. Jessup Papers, Library of Congress (LOC), Washington, DC.
[16] Raymond Dennett, Memorandum to Huntington Gilchrist and Grayson Kirk, April 6, 1945, in Box A128, Folder "IPR Pacific Council – General 1944-45," Jessup papers, LOC.
[17] Bill Wheaton (sp?) to Philip Jessup, Oct. 5, 1945, in Box A124, Folder "IPR American Council – Executive Committee 1944-46," Jessup papers, LOC.

saw the Pacific Ocean as an "American lake" in the postwar years, Pacific internationalists represented a constraint to American foreign policy at best, and a subversive element at worst.

THE HOT SPRINGS CONFERENCE, 1945

During the 1945 IPR conference at the Homestead Resort in Hot Springs, Virginia, the European powers confronted not only American, Canadian, and Chinese opposition to the continuation of imperialism in Asia, but also were forced to reckon with their own colonial subjects. Carter secured the attendance of Indian, Burmese, Cambodian and Vietnamese participants, whose presence alone put the British and French on the defensive. But even as the final wartime IPR conference was more representative than ever of Pacific peoples, it did not herald the end of European influence over these trans-Pacific scholarly connections. Quite the opposite: British and French delegates confronted and largely contained criticism of their policies, and worked harder than ever to secure a favorable position for their common interests.

For the British, the question of Indian representation at the 1945 conference in Hot Springs was just as delicate as the situation three years earlier. Carter did not wish to have a repeat performance of the uniformly British-friendly group that ultimately attended the 1942 gathering in Mont Tremblant. The situation in India had changed since 1942, however. As detailed in Chapter Two, the creation of the Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA) had led to a rupture within the Indian Institute of International Affairs (IIIA). A problem now erupted inasmuch as both groups wished to be accepted as the new IPR national council for India. For months, Carter and other IPR officials attempted

to broker a deal between the two organizations, but to no avail.[18] While members of Chatham House quietly congratulated one another on the impasse, they hoped that the deadlock would result in no Indian representation whatsoever.[19] They far preferred to avoid the subject of India altogether rather than allow Indian nationalists to air grievances at an international conference.

Undeterred, the IPR's conference committee issued invitations to both Indian institutes seeking four nominations each for the 1945 IPR conference. The ICWA accepted immediately, nominating two of its founders, H.R. Kunzru, the president of the Servants of India Society, as well as Shiva Rao, the India correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian*. In addition, they put forward the names of Mrs. V.L. Pandit, the sister of Jawaharlal Nehru, as well as Dr. Jeoraj Mehta, both of whom were Congress party members.[20] The Indian Institute of International Affairs, for its part, declined to nominate anyone, instead sending a "polite refusal" to IPR officials. Sir Sultan Ahmed, who chaired the Indian Institute along with Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, explained to British friends that IIIA members were rethinking their strategy of associating with the IPR:

[18] Political squabbles among such groups in India were relatively common, and notoriously intractable. In the fall of 1944, the chairman of the IPR's Pacific Council, Canada's Edgar Tarr, wrote Chatham House's Sir Frederick Whyte: "I very much fear that the two organizations are digging in for a fight to the death … If it were any place but India involved I would think the obvious solution would be the merger of the two organizations. Do you think this is a possibility even in India? … I confess India baffles me, but in this I doubtless have plenty of company." Tarr to Whyte, Oct. 16, 1944, in CHA 6/2/38, Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), London.

[19] Chatham House Director Ivison Macadam confidentially wrote: "Great prominence was given to the Indian point of view at the Mont Tremblant Conference, and we believe it would be better to leave the Indians out of it this time. If a really representative group from India could be secured, we would not, of course, oppose its attendance at the meeting. But as things now stand it looks impossible, and so it would be better to leave them out altogether." Macadam to Prof. Allan Fisher, May 11, 1944, in CHA 6/2/38, RIIA.

[20] Mehta ultimately did not attend the conference, but was replaced by AR Siddiqi, a member of the Legislative Assembly of Bengal, a former mayor of Calcutta, and the former president of the Muslim Chamber of Commerce.

> To speak bluntly, there is a suspicion … that the Secretariat of the IPR has not always been as impartial as is desirable, or entirely free from certain American groups anxious to press aims, and it sticks in their memory that Mr. Carter visited India apparently for the purposes of creating the Indian Council of World Affairs. They fear that the Indian Institute may put itself in the undignified position of competing with a body of whose origin they thus take a somewhat suspicious view.[21]

The members of the Indian Institute of International Relations may have preserved their dignity, but in failing to nominate any delegates to the IPR's conference, they effectively silenced their voice on the international stage. Therefore, the Indian delegation that showed up in Hot Springs, Virginia in January 1945 was considerably less amenable to the arguments for continued British presence on the subcontinent.

The January 1945 Hot Springs conference featured Indian charges against European colonialism, but the experienced British delegation limited the damage.[22] At one roundtable discussion, Indian delegates accused the British of "leaning back in their chairs and acting as if they had already left India" while they continued to enjoy full authority.[23] Sir Andrew McFadyean, the head of the British delegation, summarized the often heated exchanges as "catch-as-catch can, with no holds barred and occasionally, when the Referee was not looking, I think there was some biting."[24] But McFadyean noted that while the criticisms of Indians may have been provocative, they also were alienating to others—including, he thought, the Chinese. "As a group, [the British] policy is to allow [the Indians] all the rope they require to hang themselves," he wrote to

[21] Sir Sultan Ahmed to Lord Astor, April 28, 1944, in CHA 6/2/38, RIIA.

[22] The ten-day conference included delegations from the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Netherlands, Netherlands East Indies, India, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Also present were observers from the League of Nations, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

[23] J.A. Friedman to J.C. Vincent, February 3, 1945, Report on 1945 Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43/Institute of Pacific Relations/2-345, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.

[24] Sir Andrew McFadyean, final speech at Hot Springs Conference, Appendix B, in CHA 6/1/10, RIIA.

his British colleagues at Chatham House.[25] For all of the grief they took, the British walked away from Hot Springs confident that they had made a forceful reply to the anti-colonial attacks.

The British were not the only imperial power to share the stage with their colonial subjects at the Hot Springs conference. The French, only a few months removed from the liberation of Paris and the restoration of their republic, made a commitment to send a representative delegation to the United States. Correspondence among senior French foreign affairs officials reveals that top governmental figures were convinced that the upcoming IPR conference was an ideal place to demonstrate their commitment to the progressive colonial policies enunciated by the reformist Brazzaville Declaration earlier in 1944. The French Minister of Colonies, René Pleven, launched an outreach effort to dependent peoples living in France, and in late 1944 decided to include some of them as a part of the French delegation to the IPR conference.[26] Pleven nominated three Indochinese delegates: Prince Youtevong Sisowath, a member of the Royal Family of Cambodia; "Philippe" Tran Ba Huy, a surgeon who also wrote extensively on regional matters; and finally, "André-Marie" Tao Kim Hai, a lawyer, secretary of "La Patrie Annamite," and an author of many books on Indochina. These three were cleared to travel to the United States where they would join several other high-level French delegates, led by Paul-Emile Naggiar, the former ambassador to the Soviet Union. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, convinced that the IPR conference was of great importance, subsidized the French delegation's travels to the tune of 100,000 francs.[27]

[25] McFadyean, Jan. 9, 1945, Appendix C, in CHA 6/1/10, RIIA.

[26] For more on the relationship between the French government and the Vietnamese in France, see Virginia Thompson, "The Vietnamese Community in France," *Pacific Affairs,* Vol. 25, No. 1 (March 1952), 49-58.

[27] Ministre des Affaires Etrangères à Direction la Comptabilité, Dec. 4, 1944, in Vol. 6, Direction Asie-Océanie, 1944-1955, Archives de Ministre des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), Paris.

Although the French government itself approved the nominations of the Indochinese delegates, their presence nevertheless caused consternation among officials who were deeply concerned that the French group speak with a single voice and avoid international embarrassment. Ambassador Naggiar had only met the three Indochinese delegates mere days before their late December departure for the United States. Once they had departed, Pleven, the colonial minister, received alarming reports that certain "Annamites" (Vietnamese) living in France had recently approached the Indochinese delegates and urged them to declare their support at the IPR conference for an international mandate over French Indochina. This report concerned Pleven enough that he sent a top-secret urgent message to Georges Bidault, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, asking him to tell Ambassador Naggiar to keep an especially close eye on the Indochinese at the Hot Springs conference. "A French representative should at all times find himself next to them," Pleven warned.[28] On the eve of the conference, Pleven once again reminded Bidault that even though the Indochinese delegates were meant to be "*sures*"—that is, amenable to French positions—the other French delegates should watch them closely.[29]

Once the conference began, the Indochinese proved relatively loyal French delegates. Naggiar reported Prince Sisowath was "*très bien*," while Tao Ki May was "*docile et des plus corrects*."[30] Meanwhile, Tran Ba Huy, the surgeon whom the French

---

[28] Le Ministre des Colonies à Monsieur le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Top Secret – Urgent, Dec. 29, 1944, in Vol. 7, Direction Asie-Océanie, 1944-1955, MAE.

[29] "Bien qu'il s'agisse de personalités à priori très sures, vous devrez exercer sur eux un contrôl extrêmement discrèt et courtois mais néanmoins très serre." Ministre des Colonies à Mon. le Min. des Affaires Etrangères, Jan. 4, 1945, in Vol. 7, Direction Asie-Océanie, 1944-55, MAE.

[30] At the suggestion of Naggiar, Tao Kim Hi left the Hot Springs conference and continued on to San Francisco, where he was placed in charge of following radio programs in Vietnamese that the United States Office of War Information was sending to Indochina. He then went to the University of Wyoming in 1946 to take part in a series of conferences and debates about Vietnam, where he defended the French position "*avec un loyalisme irreprochable et un grand désintéressement*." Roger Levy, February 1946, memorandum on IPR Pacific Council meeting, in Vol. 8, Direction Asie-Océanie, MAE.

thought was most likely to have received advice from the French Vietnamese community, said nothing inappropriate. Naggiar certainly thought that all three were preferable to the Indian delegation, who showed themselves to be anti-colonial "*agitateurs*" at every opportunity. Nevertheless, the French ambassador counseled against repeating the experiment of bringing along Indochinese with the French delegation to future IPR conferences. First of all, the three Indochinese members represented almost a third of the entire French delegation—far too high, in his opinion. Second, he noted that the Indochinese were in a restricted position. They could neither speak on behalf of France as Indochinese; nor could they speak on behalf of Indochinese, for if Indochina were cut off from France at that time it would be under Japanese control. Finally, the French ambassador complained that the mere presence of Indochinese was too easily exploited by American anti-colonialists at the conference who wasted no opportunity in treating them distinctly from the other French delegates.[31]

However well the Europeans managed anti-colonial criticism, the Hot Springs conference confirmed in their mind that the Pacific internationalists in the IPR were determined to undermine their colonial projects. The question was how to respond. Some wondered whether they should quit the IPR altogether. J.M. Boeke, secretary of the Dutch council, had endured criticism of Dutch rule in Indonesia and now wrote to Chatham House that he saw little hope for the Institute: "The IPR will always remain an American Institute: you may weaken it, but you are unable to take away its American nature or transplant it into British soil." Boeke's solution was to propose an entirely new institute as a "set-off" to the IPR: an International Institute for the Study of Plural Societies, focused on Asia and Africa, with a headquarters in London, whose purpose would be simply to study the impact of Western society upon native cultures, and thereby

[31] Monsieur P.E. Naggiar à Monsieur G. Bidault, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Jan. 24, 1945, in Vol. 7, Direction Asie-Océanie, MAE.

avoid delicate questions surrounding independence movements. Boeke floated the idea to British colonial expert Lord Hailey, but Hailey's response revealed a distinct lack of enthusiasm. Hailey wrote Chatham House Director-General Ivison Macadam that Boeke's proposed institute was at once too broad a mandate and unclear in specifics—altogether a "sufficiently bewildering prospect." Hailey underscored his more general opposition to the creation of more London-based institutes, whose numbers already diluted the effectiveness of their work. Boeke's idea to replace the IPR thus expired practically at the moment of its conception.[32]

For all of the European criticism of the IPR, it was clear by 1945 that the organization was too important to be dismissed or minimized; it must be worked with, rather than around. And as the Europeans discovered at Hot Springs, perhaps they could even use the Institute to their advantage. Sir Andrew McFadyean, the head of the British delegation to Hot Springs, complained of "too many slogans, too many platitudes and too many clichés" at the conference, but he was not prepared to abandon the group altogether. McFadyean wrote to his fellow members at Chatham House that despite their frustrations, they must maintain a strong connection to the IPR, and showing solidarity with his French colleagues, he could not resist a slogan of his own: "*Les absents ont toujours tort*."[33] He continued: "[W]e cannot afford to refuse to participate in future activities of the Institute; but I am quite convinced that something must be done if they ignore the hints which Hailey must have given them, and the blunt statements which I shall have made to bring them to a sense of realities." Sir Raibeart M. MacDougall, longtime member of the Indian civil service and counselor to the governor of Burma, concurred in a separate letter to Chatham House: "If we were to break off relations with

---

[32] Boeke to Macadam, Nov. 6. 1945; and Hailey to Macadam, Nov. 21, 1945, both in CHA 6/2/37, RIIA.
[33] "Those who are absent are always wrong."

the IPR and decline to take part in any further Conference, Great Britain would immediately be 'framed' as the arch criminal in the Far East by the anti-British party in the IPR." The British had a great many American friends in the IPR, MacDougall continued, but "we cannot expect them to fight our battles if we ourselves pack in and leave the battlefield."[34]

In the course of weathering criticism at the wartime IPR conferences, British officials made another discovery: they shared a "community of interest" with the French and the Dutch delegations. As a result of the Hot Springs conference, the delegates from the European colonial powers agreed to meet and discuss how to plan their future strategy regarding the Institute, and to work with their respective governments in this regard. The Dutch readily agreed, noting their enthusiasm for such a "common front" approach. Significantly, this informal collaboration took place even as the British, French and Dutch governments were making statements to United States officials denying such contact. The Chief of the Far Eastern Department of the British Foreign Office gave an "informal yet emphatic" statement to an officer at the American embassy that there was no "understanding" between the Dutch and British over the future of Southeast Asia. A State Department memorandum to President Roosevelt repeated the denials of the British, French and Dutch on the matter of collaboration on the very day that Roosevelt had lunch with the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Oliver Stanley.[35]

Besides coordination with fellow European councils, Chatham House members also tried to bring the Americans around to their side through smaller meetings. In the summer of 1945, members of Chatham House proposed a 10-day Anglo-American IPR

---

[34] Sir Andrew McFadyean final speech at Hot Spring, Jan. 1945, Appendix B; McFadyean letter on final speech, Jan. 15, 1945, Appendix C; and Sir Raibeart M. MacDougall on Hot Springs conference, n.d., all in "Pacific Relations Committee," CHA 6/1/10, RIIA.

[35] "Preliminary Memorandum on Conversation Between the President and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Colonel Stanley," January 16, 1945; "Memorandum for the President," January 16, 1945, in RG 59, Lot Files 54D 109, Philippine and Southeast Asia Division, Microfilm C0014, Reel 6, NARA.

gathering in early September designed to smooth over differences and bring about a closer alliance between the two councils. Lord Astor wrote to the chairman of the American IPR, Dr. Robert Sproul, while Chatham House Director Ivison Macadam made a concurrent entreaty to Raymond Dennett, the American IPR's executive secretary. Dennett's personal feelings were positive toward a meeting. He anticipated a number of splits between British and American policy over Far Eastern matters in the coming years, and thus believed such a meeting would prepare Chatham House for those differences. The American council, however, voted against holding such a conference. Dennett's official response to Macadam declined the British invitation, indicating that such a meeting might create an "unfortunate impression" upon other IPR members that there existed an Anglo-American bloc. However much some Americans might be disposed to the idea, Dennett wrote privately to Macadam, the Americans were under sufficient fire, especially from China, to make such a meeting far too "risky."[36] With the olive branch rejected, Chatham House and the rest of the European councils now felt free to work assiduously toward removing the prime source of their troubles with the Institute of Pacific Relations: Secretary-General Edward Carter.

REMOVING EDWARD CARTER

In September and October 1945, Edward Carter visited Europe to shore up support among the British, French and Dutch IPR councils. Carter knew that Europeans were upset with the tenor of the wartime conferences, and wished to put the IPR on more neutral footing. If Carter expected deference and civility, he was mistaken. Carter's

---

[36] Ivison S. Macadam to Raymond Dennett, June 23, 1945; Dennett to the American Council Executive Committee, July 9, 1945; Dennett to Macadam, July 25, 1945; all in Box 196, "Chatham House Conference," Pacific Relations, COL; official Dennett regret to Macadam, July 25, 1945, in CHA 6/1/10, RIIA.

letters to Percy Corbett, the wartime chairman of the IPR's Pacific Council, amply demonstrated the tension that continued to exist between himself and the European councils.[37] Carter visited the Netherlands, and found "discouraging" news there. Many Dutch IPR members were convinced that the international IPR was a mere front operation to defend American policies, and that international research publications were overwhelmingly American-created and oriented; they demanded future IPR conferences must be held outside North America or the Institute would risk the curtailment of Dutch financial contributions. Carter feigned astonishment at "the somewhat bizarre nature of their criticism," and explained away the Dutch misapprehensions as the result of wartime Axis propaganda. But the veteran secretary-general did acknowledge that he had "inadvertently been responsible in past years for some of the things that they criticize … [and] thus this revelation … has been invaluable to me and I hope that I will have the ability to profit by it."[38] While Carter denied any inappropriate action on his part, he nevertheless realized that he could no longer take European support for granted.

Carter's visit did not get any easier when he made it to London. There, he was met by Ivison Macadam, the director of Chatham House, who "unburdened himself" regarding the IPR over two long talks. Macadam pulled no punches. He outlined the criticism that British members had endured at conferences, and charged that IPR publications, which formerly had maintained a high quality, had deteriorated into "some kind of ideology." Exactly what kind of ideology Macadam did not say, nor did Carter

[37] Corbett, a Canadian citizen, was the chairman of the Department of Government at Yale University. Corbett served as the chairman of the IPR Pacific Council, the leaders of each national council, from 1945 to 1947.

[38] Carter protested to Corbett particularly about the impression that the international IPR was essentially an arm of the U.S. government: "They, of course, have no conception of how much of a thorn in the flesh both the International Secretariat and the American Council have been to the U.S. State Department. They, in common with a few at Chatham House, blame on the International Secretariat everything that the American Council publishes which they do not like." Carter to Corbett, Sept. 29, 1945, in Box 89, "Carter, Edward – Personal," Pacific Relations, COL.

press him on this matter. Macadam told Carter that he was "tired of persuading the best men in England to go at great expense to North America only to have them subjected to unfriendly criticism from people whom they would never desire to meet again and people of a type they never met except under the auspices of the IPR." Clearly, Macadam believed anti-colonial sentiments were unfairly dominating the international secretariat, and he demanded a curtailment in Carter's activism. Like the Dutch, Macadam ended his harangue with an implicit threat of withdrawal from the IPR altogether. Carter was left with the understanding that Chatham House "was so fed up with the IPR that [Macadam] and his colleagues had come to the conclusion that they would give the Institute one more chance in the hope that it might reorganize its programme so as to be an asset instead of a liability to Chatham House." With this challenge hanging in the air, Carter left the Chatham House director once again rebuffed by an Institute partner.[39]

Many European critics of the IPR increasingly believed that Carter himself must be replaced as secretary-general before the Institute could be truly reformed.[40] Criticisms of Carter's leadership, coming from the West Coast of the United States and now in Europe, forced Carter to reassess his position as head of the international IPR.[41] Within

---

[39] Carter was careful not to ascribe Macadam's criticisms to the whole of Chatham House when Carter noted that at least "some of the [Pacific Relations] Committee and the staff feel that the IPR, even the International Secretariat, have been a most unusual asset to Chatham House and they desire more rather than less from the IPR in the future." Furthermore, Carter pointed out that Chatham House did not necessarily represent the more liberal and open-minded segment of the British population: "Many such people believe that Chatham House is a sort of steel curtain between the IPR and the British public and that until Chatham House changes the IPR cannot fully serve the British public, nor can British scholars and businessmen make their rightful contribution to the total international work of the IPR." Carter to Corbett, Oct. 12, 1945, in *Ibid.*

[40] Sir Andrew McFadyean wrote to fellow members of Chatham House from the January 1945 Hot Springs conference that Anglo-American tension in the organization would not lessen until Carter left the IPR. Jan. 15, 1945, CHA 6/1/10. Roger Levy, the chairman of the Comité d'études des Problèmes du Pacifique, wrote to his French colleagues in early 1946 that the British had actively campaigned for the removal of Carter at least since his September 1945 visit. *Note de Roger Levy*, n.d. [Feb. 1946], Vol. 7, Asie-Océanie, 1944-55, le Ministre des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), Paris.

[41] William F. Holland, Carter's successor as IPR secretary general, noted decades later: "Either the decision to ask [Carter] to resign was made by a small group on a confidential basis or it was edited out of the minutes." Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations*, p. 369.

weeks of his return, he began floating the idea of his retirement as secretary-general in conversations with close friends and IPR supporters, including officers at the Rockefeller Foundation.[42] By the end of 1945, the 67-year-old secretary-general gave word that he was willing to cede control of the international Institute he had led since 1933. The controversial, charismatic administrator had personified the IPR for more than a decade, and its stature at the end of the war was the result of his efforts more than any other individual. Yet Carter's strong-willed leadership often left others within the organization feeling on the margins, whether they were in California or in Amsterdam. Many long-time supporters of the IPR thus viewed Carter's resignation as secretary-general as a positive step as the Institute began to grapple with a changed world.

Being able to operate outside the constraints of governmental policies traditionally had given the IPR a platform to discuss the possibilities for a future world—an idealistic position that Carter did not wish the IPR to abandon. Many Europeans, however, were calling for a more dispassionate approach to IPR research projects, a concentration on long-term regional problems and the careful avoidance of controversial political subjects. Carter's position clearly was on the wane. Nevertheless, in his secretary-general's draft report to the Pacific Council, the IPR's governing body, in early 1946, Carter delivered a full defense of scholarly idealism:

> How can … research be organized to meet situations two decades ahead when those who now plan and carry out the research have not formulated the social and economic goals they would like to see dominating society in the next generation? How can long-range research for the future be planned by an Institute which some of its leaders affirm should not spend any time studying current controversial problems?

[42] In an interview with Joseph H. Willits, the social sciences director for the Rockefeller Foundation, Carter asked him "as a personal friend" for his advice on retirement. Willits responded circumspectly that such a matter was for Carter and the IPR to work out on their own. In a memorandum to Foundation colleagues, Willits made clear that he sensed that Carter's position, along with larger world events, put the IPR in a fluid state: "Deep currents are moving in IPR … I think we belong outside of them." Willits memorandum, Oct. 25, 1945, RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4235, RAC.

Carter believed that with the advent of atomic power, the problems of the postwar world required bold and innovative thinking beyond the conventional framework of nation-states. This is not to say he wished the abolition of nations, or the advent of communism, as some of his detractors later claimed. His vision of the IPR, nevertheless, as a transformative and radically international instrument meshed with his hopes for a potentially radical democratic world. In his view, the "moderate nationalisms" of the more cautious IPR members merely reproduced the mentality that led to war.[43]

Carter's desire to separate the IPR from nationalist sentiments in 1945 misread the degree to which many IPR members in Europe had subsumed themselves to their respective national policies. Nowhere was this more dramatically represented than in France. The French IPR council received subsidies for research, travel, and Pacific Council dues (totaling $1000 per year) from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a direct contravention of IPR rules that prohibited direct governmental support.[44] French governmental interest was nevertheless quite brazen in its attempt to control IPR research and conference activities from afar. The French Foreign Minister, Georges Bidault, went so far as to solicit a French official to be placed on staff at the IPR international secretariat in New York in the spring of 1945, a scheme that had the blessings of the Minister of Colonies and the French ambassador to the United States. Bidault wrote that having a French official representative at the heart of the international IPR headquarters

---

[43] Edward C. Carter, secretary general interim draft report to Pacific Council, n.d. [1945], as well as personal postscript, in Box A128, "IPR Pacific Council, Jan. 1946, Atlantic City Conference," Philip Jessup Papers, Library of Congress (LOC). Also see Carter to Devereux C. Josephs (Carnegie Corporation), Dec. 6, 1946, in Box 318, "Carnegie Appeals," Pacific Relations, COL.

[44] IPR leaders suspected at the time that the French government may have been subsidizing the French national council, but generally greeted these suspicions with an air of resignation and inevitability, presumably given the context of the recently completed war. See Item 751, Pacific Relations Committee Minutes, June 18, 1946, CHA 6/1/11, RIIA. William L. Holland, IPR's secretary general, noted in his memoirs that the French contribution to the Pacific Council was delivered on a check headed "Affaires etrangères," indicating its provenance from the French Foreign Ministry, but that "we never questioned this and gladly accepted the money." Hooper, ed., *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations,* 118.

was the only way to ensure that "our observations may be presented, and pushed, if need be." Carter and the IPR's international staff rejected this attempted French infiltration, unsurprisingly, but the episode nevertheless represented an illustrative moment about the perceived importance of the IPR to some European governmental officials, eager to leverage intellectual influence in Asia wherever they could find it.[45]

With new European activity in the IPR, and with Carter's influence on the wane, the Pacific Council met in Atlantic City in January 1946 to discuss the future scope and agenda of the Institute. The British wasted no time in seizing the initiative to circumscribe the IPR's activism. On the first afternoon of meetings, Ivison Macadam proposed changing the IPR's constitution to read: "The object of the Institute is to study the conditions of the Pacific peoples *with a view to an increase in mutual knowledge and understanding*" rather than the longstanding phrase, "with a view to the improvement of their mutual relations." The rewording was significant: Macadam's statement presupposed no harmony of interest in the Pacific region, nor any desire in working toward such a goal—a touchstone belief that had animated the group since 1927. The British leader reiterated that the IPR's purpose should be merely to study, not to improve, Pacific relations.[46] The Pacific Council put off any decision on specific constitutional changes, but Macadam clearly won the broader argument: IPR leaders, by the end of the meeting, agreed that the production of research should be the overriding focus of the group, and that they should minimize their forays into amateur diplomacy. Macadam was understandably pleased with his efforts. At the conclusion of the Pacific Council

[45] French official interest in the IPR in 1945 is well documented in the archives at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris. The first suggestion regarding the placement of a French official on the IPR international secretariat staff came from P.E. Naggiar, head of the French delegation to the Hot Springs conference to French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault and to Henri Bonnet, French ambassador to Washington. See Naggiar to Bidault, Jan. 24, 1945, March 14, 1945, and April 7, 1945; Bidault to Bonnet, June 21, 1945; all in Vols. 7 and 8, Direction Asie-Océanie, 1944-55, MAE.

[46] Minutes of the Meeting of the Pacific Council (I), Jan. 26, 1946, in Box A128, "IPR Pacific Council, Jan. 1946, Atlantic City Conference," Jessup papers, LOC.

meeting, he privately gloated to Rockefeller Foundation officials that the British were "thoroughly satisfied" with the outcome, as they had gotten "one hundred percent of what we asked for."[47]

The Atlantic City gathering also saw the formal resignation of Edward Carter as secretary-general. The man who had epitomized the activist, anti-colonialist wing of the IPR handed the torch to his successor, William L. Holland. A native of New Zealand, Holland had joined the IPR staff as a young man in 1929 and served as international research secretary from 1933 until 1944. Bookish and trim, with glasses framing a boyish face, he was far more a scholar than an organizer, and was less politically connected than Carter.[48] At first, the British were cool to the idea of Holland as the leader of the international IPR: he was now an American, after all, and moreover he was Carter's hand-picked successor. Chatham House members wondered whether Holland, the consummate Institute man, would be able to free himself from Carter's influence. But conversations at Atlantic City apparently dampened these criticisms, and in March 1946, Sir Andrew McFadyean confidently reported to the Chatham House Pacific Relations Committee that Holland's "attitude and objectives were quite different from those of the retiring Secretary-General."[49] The British Foreign Office was equally relieved to hear the news, and officials cleared the way for Holland to meet with its heads of the China, Japan, Southeast Asia and North American departments during his visit to London in June 1946. Holland, in one British official's estimation, was "intelligent and responsible … unlike the truly emotional Mr. Carter." Even if his reputation was more anti-

---

[47] Roger F. Evans, "Ivison Macadam – Chatham House," Feb. 5, 1946, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4236, RAC.
[48] William Lancelot Holland resume, n.d., in Box 327, "Holland, W.L.–Personal," Pacific Relations, COL.
[49] Holland was not McFadyean's first choice to be the next leader of the IPR, but he noted that "the only alternative to [Holland's] election would have been a continuation of Mr. E.C. Carter as Secretary-General," a situation that McFadyean clearly viewed as intolerable. Pacific Relations Committee minutes, March 12, 1946, in CHA 6/1/11, RIIA.

imperialist than the average New Zealander, Holland "will probably be amenable to reason and anxious to learn our points of view." With Carter ousted from the IPR's top job, the European councils, as well as their official diplomatic counterparts, now felt they would be given fairer hearings at future IPR gatherings.[50]

THE STRATFORD CONFERENCE, 1947

A final triumph for European interests in the IPR came with the decision by the Pacific Council to hold the first post-war IPR conference in Great Britain in September 1947. As the host national council, Chatham House members worked to make sure that this conference would be set on a more "scientific," apolitical foundation. They set a narrow agenda—"the Economic and Social Reconstruction of the Far East"—and limited conference participation to 75 official delegates, and a few dozen "guest observers." This more rigorous control of the conference agenda and membership intended to prevent the proceedings from degenerating into the "loose talk-fests" that they believed characterized the wartime proceedings.[51] On one level, the British succeeded in their objective: discussion at the 15-day conference at Stratford-on-Avon was confined to agricultural and industrial development, with little or no mention of dependencies and trusteeships. No major fights broke out between national councils. Yet what the 1947 IPR conference gained in amicability of discussion was lost in diversity of representation. The conference was marked by a preponderance of Western countries; only the Chinese sent a national delegation from Asia, with a handful of other observers from India, Burma,

---

[50] A.J. de la Marc, Far Eastern Department, May 6, 1946; and J.C., American Department, May 16, 1946, in FO 371/54067, The National Archives (TNA), Kew, United Kingdom.

[51] Annotated agenda for Pacific Council meeting (Appendix I), Dec. 18, 1945; and Pacific Council meeting report (Item 732), March 12, 1946 agenda, Pacific Relations Committee, CHA 6/1/11, RIIA.

Korea and Siam.[52] The lack of Asian delegates served as a rebuke to an Institute that prided itself on serving as a putative link between East and West.

The Dutch, French and British councils may have restricted the topics of discussion at Stratford, but internal correspondence and off-the-agenda conversations revealed the serious internal struggles each was having with an aggrieved colonial subject. The Dutch IPR council, for instance, was riven over the question of the Netherlands East Indies since the end of the war. Most members of the Netherlands-Netherlands East Indies council, centered in Amsterdam and representing more conservative business interests, were quite bitter over the prospect of greater political independence in the archipelago. A number of members who took a more liberal outlook on Indonesia, however, broke away and set up a rival group at the University of Leiden. Leaders of the now-weakened Amsterdam group, wary of a possible confrontation at Stratford, informed Percy Corbett, the IPR's Pacific Council chairman, during a visit in the fall of 1946 that Dutch participation in the upcoming conference was impossible. The Amsterdam group claimed that the fluid political situation in the archipelago meant good information was scarce, and thus would only foster amateurish debate and knee-jerk criticism of Dutch colonial policy—criticisms they already had endured at the wartime conferences. In a blunt exchange that Corbett found "quite rude," they claimed that holding any IPR conference at all in 1947 would be "premature and doomed to futility."[53] Even the promise to drop all political subjects at the conference met with skepticism from the Amsterdam group. Desperate for any Dutch participation at the Stratford gathering, and knowing that their actions would offend the official Dutch IPR council, Institute

---

[52] A handful of "observers" attended from Burma, India, Korea, and Siam. *Problems of Economic Reconstruction in the Far East: Report of the Tenth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Stratford-on-Avon, England, September 5-20, 1947* (New York, 1949), Appendix II – Conference Membership, pp. 113-125.

[53] Corbett to W.L. Holland, Sept. 14, 1946, in CHA 6/1/11, Appendix C, RIIA.

leaders managed to secure three members of the more liberal Leiden group as guest observers.[54]

Practically lost amid the drama surrounding Dutch participation at Stratford was the matter of Indonesian participation, as well as that of the Vietnamese. IPR leaders in New York requested that the Dutch and French make efforts to include colonial subjects in their national delegations, but they were unable to dictate their composition. Both the Dutch and French councils, however, found excuses not to repeat the Hot Springs experiment. They did so through an appeal to the private nature of the IPR itself. An appeal by representatives of the "Indonesian Republic" was rejected by IPR leaders on the grounds that governmental representation was not allowed at IPR conferences.[55] Similarly, the Viet-Nam Press Service in Paris petitioned IPR officials to include Vietnamese representatives in the French delegation to Stratford, but Roger Levy, the French IPR's principal leader, noted that the IPR, a private organization, could not accede to appeals from a "government agency." Levy of course made no mention of his own committee's servile relationship with the French foreign ministry, and the French refusal to include Vietnamese representatives went largely unchallenged by IPR leadership.[56] Institute leaders turned a blind eye to the close relationship between European governments and their national councils. But when Asian "officials" requested better representation at the Stratford conference, their appeals often went unanswered.

The matter of Indian representation in the IPR, however, was no longer a purely internal matter for the British by the fall of 1947. With independence recently granted to

---

[54] Ivison Macadam to William L. Holland, May 23, 1947, in Box 309, "Ivison Macadam," Pacific Relations, COL; W.L. Holland to J.H. Boeke, May 26, 1947, and Percy Corbett to J.J.L. Duyvendak, Aug. 7, 1947, in Box 310, "Netherlands-NEI Council IPR," *Ibid*.

[55] Pacific Council Minutes No. 6, Sept. 15, 1947, in Box 470, *Ibid.*

[56] The Vietnamese Press Service appealed to the Union of Democratic Control in Britain to plead its case to Chatham House officials, the hosts of the conference. Dang-chan-Lieu to Dorothy Woodman, March 14, 1947, in Box 313, "Union of Democratic Control," Pacific Relations, COL.

the Asian subcontinent, the Pacific Council acknowledged the need to incorporate Indian and Pakistani delegations into the IPR for future conferences, and admitted that they had made a "mistake in judgement" in not inviting official representatives from the Indian Council of World Affairs to attend the Stratford gathering. Chatham House members pressed for additional delays, not wishing to privilege the Indian Council of World Affairs over the Indian Institute of International Affairs, which had closer ties to Britain. Over the hesitations of Sir Andrew McFadyean and other members of Chatham House, the American delegation pushed the IPR's governing body formally to accept groups in India and Pakistan as IPR national councils as soon as possible.[57]

As the Stratford conference wore on through mid-September, it became increasingly clear that the lack of Asian members was a major hindrance to discussion. As one conference observer from the Rockefeller Foundation noted, the conference took on the aspect of "a consultation of Western doctors on an absent and unwilling group of Eastern patients."[58] Holland, the IPR's recently elected secretary-general, admonished delegates that they must not judge Asian problems by Western standards. Yet this mandate proved almost impossible in a conference dominated by British, American and Canadian members. During one of the final plenary sessions, Pao-Nan Cheng, a member of the Chinese IPR council, announced that he, a self-proclaimed "inscrutable oriental," felt obliged to speak.[59] Cheng noted that other delegates often talked about the introduction of "democracy" into Asia as if it were a panacea, and without a critical examination of the relationship between political philosophy and economic well-being.

---

[57]Ivison S. Macadam to William L. Holland, Jan. 13, 1947; Holland to Macadam, May 22, 1947; and Macadam to Holland, May 23, 1947, all in Box 309, "Ivison Macadam," Pacific Relations, COL. Also see Pacific Council Minutes No. 5, Sept. 12, 1947,in Box 470, *Ibid.*

[58] Roger F. Evans, "IPR Tenth International Conference," Dec. 4, 1947, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4240, RAC.

[59] Cheng served as the director of the Washington, DC office of the Chinese National Recovery and Relief Administration.

Cheng agreed with Holland that a Western mindset often obscured the real problems in Asia:

> [T]oo much Anglo-Saxon psychology which has not the willing consent of Asian peoples will fail. We may set up beautiful formulas but we cannot see, or we refuse to see, all the invisible forces and undercurrents at work. I am reminded of the criminal who tried to commit the perfect crime, but always later something turned up to incriminate him. These invisible currents are already making themselves felt.[60]

Revolutionary changes in Asia were these "invisible currents," Cheng observed. While IPR leaders prided themselves on their unique contacts with Asia, they obviously could not come to grips with these changes in a conference room in Stratford-on-Avon without a significant number of Asian members present. Only through a renewed effort to encourage and support such contact would the IPR live up to its promise as the best private bridge between West and East.

IPR delegates left Stratford in late September in 1947 only to confront a series of immediate and confounding challenges. They had earned a reputation for national service during the war, yet they now needed to distance themselves from governments in order to maintain their independent scholarly reputations. Their private status gave them the ability to speak out bluntly at conferences, yet they now needed to restrict their meeting agendas in order to salve wounded European pride, and mitigate attacks on their supposed political biases. And while IPR leaders wished to maintain the highest scholarly standards of objective research, they were now faced with a more pressing demand: the encouragement of Asian national councils to join the ranks of Pacific internationalists. In the postwar years, IPR leaders began to recognize that they could have a vital role to play in winning over the "mind of Asia." But they could only do so if the "absent and unwilling" Eastern patients were allowed to become doctors as well.

---

[60] Stratford-upon-Avon Conference minutes, Plenary Session VII, Sept. 18, 1947, in CHA 6/4/72, RIIA.

Chapter Four

“Something to Join”: Asia and the IPR, 1947-1950

However ambivalent toward the onset of the Cold War, Pacific internationalists felt new urgency regarding their work in reaching out to Asia the late 1940s. Leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations saw not only academic value in encouraging Asian collaboration with Western elites, but they were also sensitive to the larger geopolitical realities of the moment. How could the West hope to win over Asian minds if Westerners were not fully aware of the real concerns of Asians themselves? In a 1951 article, Paul Linebarger, an American professor of Asian politics, gave the United States a failing grade for its post-war propaganda efforts in Asia. The United States, Linebarger wrote, wanted Asians to love Americans, but did not give Asians a sense of full participation in a larger cause. Communists “offer people something to join, something to do, something to fight,” he wrote. “You couldn’t join the American side if you were an Asian. There isn’t anything to join.”[1] Leaders of the IPR, however, felt that they were uniquely situated to offer Asian intellectuals something to join—a project they now took on with renewed energy.

One of the greatest tasks for Pacific internationalists in the postwar period was to grasp the enormous complexity of a region in flux. In the several years following the war, millions of people emerged from colonialism into independence, an upheaval that Arnold J. Toynbee called the most significant event of the twentieth century and “more explosive than the atom bomb.”[2] Nationalist movements in places such as India, the

---

[1] Paul M.A. Linebarger, “The Struggle for the Mind of Asia,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 278 (Nov. 1951): 32-37.

[2] Quoted in G.L. Mehta, “Asian Nationalism Vis-à-vis Other Asian Nations,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 318 (July 1958), p. 93.

Dutch East Indies and French Indochina pledged to reverse centuries of European dominance in Asia. China embraced communist leadership in 1949. Events often seemed to outpace the scholarly assessments of the situation. By the mid-1950s, historian Hugh Tinker remarked that Asian specialists were like spectators at a magic lantern show: "before one situation has become familiar—click—it has been replaced by another."[3] As European, American and Asian politicians struggled to make sense of the rapidly shifting geopolitical terrain in the region, IPR intellectuals began the process of reaching out to Asian elites in these newly independent countries.

The situation in Asia may have been in flux, but the stakes were real. Western policymakers and Pacific internationalists alike were concerned with preventing the emergence of an anti-Western bloc geared around revolutionary Asian nationalism. The ideas of the Institute of Pacific Relations appeared to offer at least one means by which trans-Pacific private contact could be maintained, and engender a wider solidarity between West and East. Internationalists in the IPR did not reject nascent Asian regionalism; in fact they had done much to develop this sensibility. Yet they were also aware of the dangers of a purely pan-Asian movement, and wished to situate Asian regionalism within a broader internationalist perspective. Their efforts to enlist new Asian councils into the international IPR reflected this imperative.

The "loss" of China to the Communist Party in the fall of 1949 dramatically changed the circumstances for leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations. For one, the Institute was forced to accept the dissolution of the China council of the IPR, a severance of a more than 20-year relationship without any promise of renewal. Second, the prospect of collaboration between the neutralist Indians and the communist Chinese suddenly took on a far more menacing prospect for Western policymakers. Third,

[3] Hugh Tinker, review of Sir Francis Low, *Struggle for Asia* (London, 1955), in *International Affairs*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (April 1956): 250-251.

American participants in the IPR found themselves caught between political extremes. In the United States, conservative activists targeted American members as complicit in the fall of Nationalist China. During the IPR's 1950 conference in India, meanwhile, Asians put American members on the defensive regarding "imperial" U.S. regional foreign policy. The launching of the Korean War only exacerbated both of these trends, making the IPR's project of reconciling West and East a greater challenge than ever before.

THE ASIAN RELATIONS CONFERENCE, 1947

At the end of World War II, the attempt to create an Asian regional sensibility entered a new phase. Japan's vision of a regional "co-prosperity sphere" had collapsed with its imperial plans in World War II, and its expansion into China and Korea had left a distinctly bitter taste for coerced federalism. Many in Southeast Asia, meanwhile, had long been suspicious of Chinese attempts at regional dominance.[4] Despite these fractured cultural identities, Indians at the end of the war took the lead in promoting pan-Asian values, and even the possibility of some kind of political federation, as a way to establish their regional leadership. In December 1945, Congress party leader Jawaharlal Nehru proposed the idea of an all-Asian conference to Shiva Rao, special correspondent at the *Manchester Guardian* and a participant at the IPR's Hot Springs conference earlier that year. Nehru quickly made concrete designs on an unofficial cultural gathering to exchange ideas regarding the common problems among Asian countries—problems he had discussed with the IPR's Edward Carter as early as 1939. But with the end of the war, Nehru now took action. By early 1946, the Indian Council of World Affairs

---

[4] William Henderson, "The Development of Regionalism in Southeast Asia," *International Organization,* Vol. 9, No. 4 (Nov. 1955): 463-476.

(ICWA) was tapped to develop a conference agenda and invite delegates to meet in New Delhi in March 1947.[5]

From its inception, it was clear that the Asian Relations Conference would not be an Institute of Pacific Relations kind of gathering. First of all, its scope was decidedly pan-Asian, rather than trans-Pacific. Organizers invited 29 Asian countries to send delegates, with limited "observer" positions allocated for Australia, Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as specific organizations such as the IPR and the United Nations. But it would be a mistake to interpret the Asian Relations Conference as a rejection of IPR ideals or practices. The conference's primary organizing body, the Indian Council of World Affairs, was in many ways a child of the IPR. Founded in 1943, and devoted to the objective study of international affairs, the Indian council had limited experience in international conferences beyond sending a delegation to the IPR's Hot Springs conference in 1945. Significantly, the group's executive secretary, Angadipuram Appadorai, asked IPR officials for contact information for other Asian associations and independent scholars before it could even send out invitations. The Asian Relations Conference, Appadorai noted, was modeled on the IPR template, and he wrote to Institute colleagues that he hoped the gathering would live up to their "highest standard," a sentiment that reflected the strong regard he felt toward the Pacific organization.[6]

The March 1947 Asian Relations Conference, with its all-Asian cast, did not represent a rebuke so much as a challenge to the IPR and indeed the West in general. The individual topics discussed—from anti-colonial nationalism to agricultural

---

[5] D. Gopal, ed., *Asian Relations: Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, March April 1947,* 2nd ed. (New Delhi: Authorspress, 2003), 1-3.
[6] A. Appadorai to Edward C. Carter, Aug. 2, 1946, in Box 215, "Asia Conference;" and Appadorai to William L. Holland, Oct. 4. 1946, in Box 309, "Inter-Asian Relations Conference," Pacific Relations, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

development and public health—were less important than the fact that Asian nations were prepared to speak for themselves. Westerners present were there to listen rather than guide. Nehru, who recently had been appointed India's foreign minister in advance of formal independence, delivered an inaugural address to more than 10,000 people assembled in Delhi's historic *Purana Qila* (Old Fort), first in Hindi and then in English. "We stand at the end of an era and on the threshold of a new period of history," Nehru began. "A change is coming over the scene now and Asia is again finding herself. We live in a tremendous age of transition and already the next stage takes shape when Asia takes her rightful place with the other continents." Nehru spoke of Asian unity as a natural condition, disrupted by centuries of Western imperialism that isolated countries from one another:

> Today this isolation is breaking down because of many reasons, political and other. The old imperialisms are fading away. The land routes have revived and air travel suddenly brings us very near to each other. This Conference itself is significant as an expression of that deeper urge of the mind and spirit of Asia which has persisted in spite of the isolationism which grew up during the years of European domination. As that domination goes, the walls that surround us fall down and we look at each other again and meet as old friends long parted.[7]

The formulation of a natural Asian regional affinity, Nehru concluded, was only one step on the path toward overcoming "narrow nationalism" and arriving at the larger ideal of world federation, based on universal human rights. Nehru's broad internationalist vision tracked closely with traditional IPR ideals, and received broad support by the Western members in attendance.

Delegates at the Asian Relations Conference quickly made clear that their purpose was to identify commonalities, not to pass any potentially controversial political resolutions, which mollified Western observers still further. British policymakers, in particular, were struck by the relatively mild tone struck by the conference's delegates

[7] Inaugural Address, *Asian Relations*, pp. 23-30.

regarding their past treatment. While British imperialism in India may not have received any plaudits in New Delhi, it did not, in 1947, suffer particular scorn either. One British observer at the conference, the Commonwealth historian Nicholas Mansergh, wrote a detailed report for the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) that circulated around the Colonial Office. Mansergh was a cautious supporter of the conference that announced "the awakening of a continent," even if he felt the phrase to be cliché. The Asian sense of confidence, he wrote, was great enough that the attitude toward British imperialism was one of condescension rather than anger toward a policy obviously in retreat. Delegates therefore "could afford to be tolerant and kind."[8] For the British, this sentiment was a novel one. They had been admired, feared, and hated, but for the first time in generations, they were faced with a new attitude: relative indifference.

Mansergh's optimistic conference report put British officials at ease concerning the potential formation of an Asian bloc. Middle Eastern nations had assembled a similar kind of conference in Cairo in 1945, which led to the creation of the Arab League, a group that often criticized Western policies. But Mansergh concluded that the assembled Asians displayed no such unity that could threaten the West; linguistic, religious and cultural divisions prevented a single Asian consciousness. Significantly, he noted, the only acceptable common language at the Asian Relations Conference was English. Furthermore, just beneath the surface of the conference bubbled tension between the India's delegates. The Muslim League led a boycott of the conference, claiming that it was merely a ploy for Congress Party officials to claim leadership over Asian affairs. Chinese members, meanwhile, were not prepared to concede the leadership of Asian affairs to Indians. Southeast Asian countries, more than any other group, were beginning to develop a sense of political solidarity with one another, but maintained a deep

[8] P.N.S. Mansergh, "The Inter-Asian Relations Conference," April 28, 1947, in CO 537/2092, The National Archives (TNA), Kew, United Kingdom.

suspicion of both Chinese and Indian interest in their region. In short, the continent-wide discussions at the Asian Relations Conference revealed fractiousness beneath the expressions of unity, and therefore should be "cautiously but nonetheless sincerely welcomed in the West," Mansergh concluded.

Asian elites at the conference were determined to continue their efforts at regional solidarity, and thus designed institutional machinery to carry on their work. To this end, delegates created the Asian Relations Organization (ARO), whose avowed purpose was, first, to promote the study and understanding of Asian problems; second, to foster friendly relations between the peoples of Asia; and third, to further their general well-being. This all-Asian international organization borrowed heavily (if not explicitly) from the Institute of Pacific Relations' governing ideals and organizational structure, with the significant exclusion of Westerners. Individual national councils in each Asian country were meant to carry on scholarly, non-political work in international affairs, and periodically gather together for international conferences. Bowing to pressure from their rivals for Asian leadership, the Indian organizers agreed to allow the Chinese to host the second ARO conference, scheduled for 1949.[9]

British policymakers, on the cusp of relinquishing formal control over India, initially were concerned about losing their voice in the subcontinent if the Asian Relations Organization succeeded in excluding Western members. India had a voice in the West through the Institute of Pacific Relations, the British argued, so why not allow Chatham House to affiliate with the Asian relations group? Officials in the Foreign Office expressed concern, moreover, regarding the possibility that the Asian Soviet republics, like Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, might use the ARO as a platform for Soviet

[9] "Permanent Asian Relations Organization Establishment Decided Upon at Delhi Conference," April 2, 1947, in DO 35/2246, TNA. The 1949 ARO conference in China never took place, owing to political instability in the midst of the Chinese revolution.

propaganda. As one of the few Western observers at the Asian Relations Conference, Mansergh had the opportunity to have lunch with Nehru in mid-April, a few days after the conference, to express these British concerns. The Indian leader did his best to placate British worries. Nehru supported the idea of close association, if not membership, between Chatham House and the Asian Relations Organization. He remarked that Australia and New Zealand should be considered as full regional members, and that he did not anticipate an influential role for the Soviet republics in the Asian organization. In the British High Commissioner's office in India, Sir Terence Shone reacted favorably to Nehru's remarks, and determined that Great Britain should abandon its bid for outright membership in the ARO "and thereby avoid any step that might be interpreted as unwanted interference and might so alienate potential friends and allies." Shone had confidence that British supporters and surrogates in Asia such as Burma, Malaya, Ceylon, and Singapore could adequately represent a sympathetic point of view in any new Asian regional organization.[10]

Within the leadership of the Institute of Pacific Relations, meanwhile, the challenge of the Asian Relations Organization was made abundantly clear a few months later at the September 1947 Stratford conference. With only one Asian delegation from China and a handful of observers, the conference took on a decidedly Western aspect.[11] Americans and Europeans alike noted this problem, and pressed for greater representation among Asian nations. "There was a time when the IPR had a kind of monopoly in its field," the American delegation said in a formal statement, but the Asian Relations Conference, and the creation of the ARO, had now changed this fact. "The IPR can both

---

[10] Cabinet Office to High Commissioner for the UK in India, Secret Cypher Telegram, March 19, 1947; P.N.S. Mansergh, "Note on a Conversation with Pandit Jawaharlal on 14th April 1947," April 15, 1947; Terence Shone to Secretary of the Cabinet, April 25, 1947, all in CO 537/2092, TNA. R.M.A. Hankey, "Inter-Asian Relations Conference," May 9, 1947, in FO 371/63541, TNA.
[11] See Chapter Three.

cooperate and compete with such developments, to the great profit of all concerned. But in both cooperation and competition, unless we are prepared to adapt ourselves flexibly to changing circumstances, we shall be eclipsed."[12] The American delegation proposed that the IPR should work to build up research programs in Asian countries, which would challenge the IPR's international secretariat to undertake more extensive translation and coordination responsibilities among the member councils. The British and French delegations, meanwhile, saw an additional bonus in greater Asian representation, as it was yet another way of diluting American influence within the organization.

Most national councils agreed, in principle, that the Institute of Pacific Relations should encourage greater participation of Asian voices in the Institute. But how could they achieve this goal? In the several months after the war, leaders of the IPR debated seriously whether to move the international headquarters from New York City to the Pacific Coast (San Francisco, Seattle, or Vancouver), or even to Asia (Shanghai or Manila). Some simply wished to separate the American council and the international secretariat's headquarters, located within the same building on East 54th St. Others within the IPR believed that the leaders were far too close to American diplomatic machinery and governmental groups at the new United Nations rather than with the actual people of the Asia-Pacific region. Still others thought that new Asian councils could be encouraged more directly with an IPR international headquarters close by. In the end, however, the convenience of the New York office, with its proximity to foundation supporters, other international organizations and its easy contact with European members, won the day. The IPR's central offices would remain on the American East Coast for the rest of its existence. But the advent of the Asian Relations Organization had had its impact. IPR leaders now looked with particular urgency upon

[12] "Suggestions to the International Research Committee," Sept. 1947, CHA 6/4/74, Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), London.

the Asian institutes of international relations as a way to maintain the Institute's status as a bridge across the Pacific—at once supportive of Asian nationalism, but ultimately committed to building a sense of Asian internationalism that could include Western participation.[13]

EVANGELIZING THE IPR

Although leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations decided not to move their international headquarters, they worked hard to bolster the Asian presence within the Institute during the years after World War II. Asians, Europeans and even Americans themselves had been crying out for this change in IPR orientation for years, not least to cut away at the perceived U.S. dominance of the international group. Between the years 1947 and 1950 IPR leaders worked hard to develop and sustain new Asian councils, especially in countries that had recently emerged from Western colonialism. But success at this effort was mixed. One new Asian council—the Indian Council of World Affairs—grew into a formidable Asian institute capable of vocalizing a strong, independent perspective within the Institute, while another council in Japan was reconstituted. In most other cases, however, numerous difficulties, ranging from internal political divisions, lack of funds or personnel, or wider turmoil within the country prevented individual Asian councils from acting as a strong countervailing force to the Western presence in the IPR.

Institute officials set about a new campaign to set up institutes of international relations as a kind of intellectual missionary work in the newly emergent countries of Asia. Edward Carter, the former IPR secretary-general, visited several countries in Asia

[13] W.L. Holland, "Reasons for Moving the Secretariat from New York," [1946], Box 204, "W.L. Holland," Pacific Relations, COL.

for a few months in 1948 in his capacity as a consultant for the United Nations Economic Commission to Asia and the Far East (ECAFE). With his usual inexhaustible energy, Carter used his spare time to spread the IPR gospel, sending back several-page memos at a time on his progress. His essential conclusion was that "[w]e have not done nearly enough IPR propaganda in Asia," Carter wrote his successor William Holland from Siam. "[I]n the newly organized countries and unorganized countries we have a clear field." Carter met with old YMCA friends, U.S. intelligence officials, and top Asian governmental leaders throughout the region, especially those with Western ties. Carter waxed enthusiastically about the potential to "educate" various Asian dignitaries, ambassadors and other international officials, especially those with extra cash, about lending their support for IPR activities.[14]

But the prospect of setting up a strong IPR presence in these emergent countries was daunting. Asian intellectuals may have wished to establish institutes of international affairs, but had little in the way of financial resources or qualified members willing to support such ventures. The IPR, moreover, had standards for the creation of new national councils: the national organization needed to demonstrate that it was a functioning research institute focusing on international affairs, with an active publication record; that it was independent and non-partisan, with no direct government funding for its operations; and finally that its membership was representative, with a healthy mix of scholarly and business interests. Could smaller Asian countries hope to achieve this, and thereby gain entry into the IPR's international structure? A meeting of top IPR leaders at the Rockefeller Foundation in early 1949 focused on this point, and participants acknowledged that "concessions [on research standards] must be made if all-important

---

[14] E. C. Carter to W.L. Holland, July 13, 1948, via Pan American "Resolute" Bangkok to Hong Kong, in Box 231, "Carter, Edward C. – General," Pacific Relations, COL.

Far Eastern participation is to be secured."[15] Holland, the IPR's new secretary-general, offered a plan to expedite membership for smaller countries, and then build up standards within the group as quickly as possible.

Bolstering Asian membership proved to be no easy task, as the situation in Burma illustrated. IPR officials targeted the Burma Council of World Affairs as a potential national council—a pre-existing group but with little outside support. With Burma's formal independence from the United Kingdom in 1948, it appeared an ideal time to emphasize the need for greater study and cooperation in international relations. Holland wrote J.S. Furnivall, a former British colonial officer, respected author, and advisor to the Burmese government, regarding the possibility of reviving the council.[16] Furnivall succeeded in rounding up a handful of Burmese citizens—an accountant and a former judge, among them—to resuscitate the organization, but with mixed results. When the head of Chatham House's Pacific Relations committee, A.S.B. Olver, visited the Burma Council of World Affairs in late 1950 he reported that more Indians than Burmese seemed to be running the meetings![17] In any case, the Burmese were unable to provide sufficient evidence of an active research agenda to justify their inclusion as an IPR national council for the next several years.[18]

---

[15] Roger F. Evans, interviews with Sir Andrew McFadyean, Sir George Sansom, Huntington Gilchrist and William Holland, Jan. 31, 1949, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4242, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.

[16] W.L. Holland to J.S. Furnivall, Aug. 9, 1949, in Box 319, "Furnivall, J.S.," Pacific Relations, COL.

[17] This accusation, inserted into the minutes of Chatham House's Pacific Relations committee, provoked a protest from Furnivall insisting that he was the only foreigner on the BCWA's organizing committee, and he went on suggest that perhaps Olver had "taken for Indian all those who did not wear a Burmese costume." Olver responded defensively: "I do not think I could have made a mistake about this as it would be difficult not to distinguish between an Indian and Burmese face." Jan. 2, 1951 minutes; Furnivall to Olver, Feb. 25, 1951; Olver to Furnivall, March 7, 1951, all in Appendix C, Pacific Relations Committee 116th Meeting, CHA 6/1/12, RIIA.

[18] W.L. Holland to M.A. Raschid, May 19, 1950, and Aug. 21, 1950, in Box 324, "Burma," Pacific Relations, COL.

Even in countries that showed a greater ability to establish institutes of international affairs, IPR leadership sometimes demurred from accepting them into the fold over questions of fair representation. In February 1946, a group of Koreans established a Korean foreign affairs association, and that summer sent a cable to William Holland asking to affiliate with the IPR. Holland noted that while the proposed membership looked sound, the group appeared to consist solely of southern Koreans, who were living under American military government at the time. Any true Korean institute of international affairs must also include Koreans living in the north, he believed, even though reconciliation between the two was a distant prospect, at best.[19] The setback was a blow to the Koreans, who had been marginalized from IPR activities for decades.[20] But even in the postwar era, international recognition was slow in coming. A single guest observer—Mr. Kim Woo Pyung, the executive secretary of the National Economic Board for the South Korean interim government—attended the IPR's Stratford conference in 1947. The Korean Institute of International Affairs continued to operate in the postwar years, but with little organizational help from the IPR.[21]

A more established Asian council, the Philippines IPR, had its own internal problems, largely the result of political fallout from the war. Conquered by Japan in early 1942, numerous prominent intellectuals in the Philippines worked under Japanese occupation for the duration of the war. In the aftermath of Japan's surrender, the reckoning began. Claro Recto published *Three Years of Enemy Occupation* in 1946, essentially an extended apologia for those who participated in the wartime military administration of the Philippines. Conrado Benitez, the chairman of the Philippine

---

[19] W.L. Holland to P.M. Corbett, July 26, 1946, in Box 204, "Holland, W.L.," Pacific Relations, COL.
[20] Korean delegates had been present at the IPR's inaugural gathering in Honolulu in 1925, but they had been forced to withdraw in 1929 at the insistence of the Japanese, who insisted that the Koreans be represented by the Japanese empire.
[21] American delegation Stratford meeting notes, Sept. 14, 1947, in Box 220, "International Secretariat—Pacific Council," Pacific Relations, COL.

Council of the IPR, dean of the College at the University of the Philippines and a prominent supporter of President Manuel Roxas, wrote an introduction to the book, in which he extolled its virtues as part of a "public obligation" to understand what happened during the war, a seeming endorsement of the so-called collaborationists.[22] But William Holland saw only trouble when he received a signed copy of Recto's book. Although he was personally friendly with Benitez, Holland noted that American governmental officials already had expressed their suspicions about the loyalty of Benitez and other Philippine IPR members supportive of Roxas for the latter's participation in the wartime government.[23]

The issue of wartime collaboration and the Philippine IPR erupted into a full-blown media circus in February 1947, when Holland made a routine visit to the Philippines as part of a larger Asian trip. At a meeting of the Philippine IPR, Holland presented to Benitez a complimentary copy of a recent American IPR pamphlet, *Cross Currents in the Philippines.* Holland had little idea, however, of the pamphlet's potentially incendiary contents. Co-authored by Bernard Seaman and Laurence Salisbury, the American IPR-produced booklet was highly critical of President Roxas and declared his supporters to be "collaborationist" and "fascist-minded," including prominent citizens like Abelardo Subido, editor of the *Manila Post*.[24] Subido promptly filed suit against Holland for publicly "exhibiting" the allegedly libelous pamphlet, and had the IPR secretary-general briefly detained by the police. In the heat of the moment,

---

[22] Claro M. Recto, *Three Years of Enemy Occupation: The Issue of Political Collaboration in the Philippines* (Manila: People's Publishers, 1946), xii. Conrado Benitez, a prominent English-language journalist and co-author of the 1935 Philippine constitution, was a long-standing supporter of the IPR.
[23] W.L. Holland to P.M. Corbett, April 26, 1946, in Box 204, "Holland, W.L.," Pacific Relations, COL.
[24] Both authors were American. Seaman was on the staff of the Army Writers Project in the Philippines during the war, while Salisbury was with the State Department, attached to the staff of the American High Commissioner. Julius C.C. Edelstein, Acting Director of Information and Cultural Relations, U.S. Embassy, Manila, Despatch 526, Feb. 13, 1947, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.

Subido even threatened to kill Seaman and Salisbury for accusing him of being a Japanese agent! Adding to the embarrassment for Holland and the IPR was the publication of a story about Philippine Ambassador to the United States Joaquin Miguel Elizalde, who reportedly suggested that Philippine IPR members should resign their membership because of the pamphlet's accusations. Newspaper reports fanned the flames for several days before Subido agreed to drop the case, apologies were issued all around, and Holland was allowed to continue with his trip. But tensions between the Philippine IPR and their American counterparts remained. From this episode it was clear that Filipino intellectuals were still working their way through not only the aftermath of Japanese occupation, but also the larger legacy of American imperialism. Nationalist sentiment therefore took on a particularly anti-American cast, and hampered full Filipino participation in the IPR during the post-war period.[25]

More positive news came from Japan, still under occupation by the American military. The Japanese national council had not participated in the Institute of Pacific Relations since early 1941, but emerged in the postwar period ready to renew its ties. American occupation officials apparently were eager as well; General Douglas MacArthur's advisers promoted the revitalization of the Japan Institute of Pacific Studies, which had served as the Japanese IPR council before the war. With the resumption of international postal service in Japan on May 1, 1948, the Japanese Institute's longtime secretary, M. Matsuo, immediately sent a long letter to William Holland requesting renewed affiliation with the IPR. Matsuo described the Japanese group's recent successes: the opening of a new regional committee in the Kansai district (including the cities of Osaka and Kyoto), a major research project on Japanese land utilization, and the

[25] "IPR Official Appears at Fiscal's Office to Answer Libel Charge," Feb. 13, 1947, Manila Post; "IPR Booklet on Philippines Leads to Suit Against Holland," Feb. 13, 1947, Manila Tribune; "The People of the Philippines vs. William L. Holland– Petition to Dismiss," Feb. 17, 1947, Republic of the Philippines, Office of the City Fiscal, Manila, all in Box 308, "William L. Holland," Pacific Relations, COL.

publication of a series of booklets on the economic and political problems confronting Japan. But all this renewed activity could not hide the group's lack of international connections. "Having been isolated for all practical purposes for a decade or so, Japanese scholars feel sore lack of advanced Western intellectual achievements," Matsuo wrote. In 1948, Japan had not yet been granted formal independence, but Matsuo and his Japanese colleagues were eager to return to the IPR community they had been separated from since the beginning of World War II.[26]

Western IPR leaders were happy to see a strengthened Japanese council come back into the fold as a sign of growing Asian membership. But they first needed proof that the old Japanese council had been thoroughly purged of its pre-war leadership. Charles E. Martin, a University of Washington professor, visited the Japan Institute of Pacific Studies in October 1948 and attended a meeting of its Board of Directors. Martin sent to New York a confidential memorandum that confirmed that the governing board—comprised of presidents of companies, universities and news organizations—was well balanced and free from "ideological machinations."[27] In January 1949, the IPR's governing body, the Pacific Council, approved the Japanese Institute's application for affiliation. Dr. Hyce Ouchi, vice president of the Japanese Institute and an economics professor at the University of Tokyo, submitted a statement to the IPR repudiating the past actions of the Japanese council and promising that their re-entry into the international organization would facilitate the democratic project in postwar Japan.[28] In the fall of 1949, Holland made a personal visit to the Japanese Institute, where he formally welcomed it back into the IPR community. Mr. K. Shidehara, the speaker of the

[26] M. Matsuo to W.L. Holland, May 4, 1948, in Box 316, "Japan Institute of Pacific Studies;" and I.P.R. Bulletin, Vol. IV, No.1, May 1948, in Box 234, "International Secretariat," Pacific Relations, COL.
[27] C.E. Martin to W.L. Holland, Oct. 26, 1948, in Box 316, "Japan Institute of Pacific Studies" Pacific Relations, COL.
[28] "Prepared Text of Professor Ouchi's Statement to the Pacific Council Meeting," Jan. 1949, in Box 321, "Material for Pacific Council Meeting," Pacific Relations, COL.

House of Representatives for the Japanese Diet, commended the IPR secretary-general in a special session of the Japanese council, and noted the "supreme importance" of the renewal of Japanese contact with the international group: "It will serve as a barometer for Japan to see how the wind blows in distant lands," Shidehara predicted. "I fervently pray for the smooth working of this commendable enterprise."[29]

The speedy re-admittance of a Japanese council into the IPR family was a celebrated event in Japan, but the group's re-entry caused some unforeseen complications for the international IPR. Despite Martin's protestations of a "well-balanced" group, some intellectuals in Japan began to paint the Japanese IPR as a leftist organization. Masao Ichimata, a professor at Waseda University, brazenly claimed during a meeting with IPR leaders that the Japanese IPR was "under Communist influence," a highly inflammatory (and unsubstantiated) charge during the height of McCarthyist red-baiting in the United States.[30] Matsuo, the Japanese council's executive secretary, hastily dismissed the charges as complaints by outsiders who felt excluded from the reconfigured Japanese IPR. He cited the patronage of politically safe and prominent establishment figures like Shidehara, as well as Naoto Ichimada, governor of the Bank of Japan and Kumakichi Nakajima, president of the Japan Foreign Trade Association. "As far as the present members of the Institute are concerned," Matsuo wrote Holland, "there is absolutely no split at all among our members and … there is no trend whatever of leftist influence."[31] Mollified, if not put entirely at ease, Holland and other IPR leaders urged the Japanese to use caution and discretion in its future activities.

---

[29] K. Shidehara speech, Nov. 7, 1949, in Box 253, "Pacific Council (1)," Pacific Relations, COL.
[30] MSF [Miriam S. Farley] to WLH [William L. Holland], Oct. 23, 1950, in Box 260, "International Secretariat – Other national councils," Pacific Relations, COL.
[31] M. Matsuo to W.L. Holland, June 10, 1950, in Box 328, "Japanese Council," Pacific Relations, COL.

Ideological divisions in Japan paled in comparison to the political turmoil enveloping China in the postwar years. As early as 1946 the Chinese IPR council was beginning to strain under the reopening of civil war between nationalist and communist factions. During World War II, the council had maintained its strong ties to Chiang Kai-shek and the nationalists, and complained vociferously whenever fellow IPR members attacked the government's policies. The chairman of China's IPR council, the prominent philosopher Hu Shih, had served as wartime ambassador to the United States and was now the chancellor of Peking University. Yet even Hu could do nothing to prevent the drift toward demoralization in the council, symptomatic of a larger malaise as nationalists lost ground to the growing communist movement. Meanwhile, competitors to the Chinese IPR arose. T.V. Soong, Chiang Kai-shek's brother-in-law and incidentally no great friend of Hu Shih, sponsored the creation of a new organization, the China Institute of International Affairs, and enlisted some leading Chinese scholars to join, which only sapped the Chinese IPR still further.[32] During a 1948 visit to China, Edward Carter found the Chinese IPR to be practically non-existent, and recommended that thousands of dollars be poured into the organization. "Personally I think it would be healthier to have a strongly and militantly KMT China IPR than to have no IPR at all which almost is the case today," Carter wrote his colleagues.[33] Instead, a kind of quiet despair settled over the group as the country slipped further into chaos.

With the Chinese IPR essentially moribund, IPR officials increasingly relied on Americans in China to provide information and connections regarding news on the civil war. In this regard no one could equal Dorothy Borg, a professor at Peiping National University who served as an American IPR staffer during the critical months of

[32] William L. Holland to Percy Corbett, July 26, 1946, in Box 204, "Holland, W.L.," Pacific Relations, COL.
[33] E.C. Carter to assorted, Aug. 5, 1948, in Box 231, "Edward C. Carter – general," Pacific Relations, COL.

revolution. Borg, who later would become a mentor to generations of China scholars at Columbia University, was a "tower of strength" for the Institute and a boost to its prestige, Carter reported after his 1948 visit.[34] By February of 1949, Borg was convinced that the Chinese Communists would soon come into power, and advised IPR officials to adjust accordingly. Borg noted that Hu Shih most likely would be placed in exile, along with the rest of the Chinese IPR board, but that IPR officials should welcome the opportunity to "clean house—heaven knows it has been needed for many years."[35] Perhaps the revolution might force American scholars to make contacts with Chinese intellectuals beyond those favored by the East Coast elite, she concluded.

A few stalwart members such as Liu Yu-Tang (Daniel Lew) worked to secure past-due contributions to the Pacific Council, and held out hope that perhaps the Chinese IPR council might reconfigure itself as a mixture of members in exile in Taiwan, and those who remained in Peiping and were amenable to the new regime.[36] But the revolution soon rendered any coordination of Chinese intellectuals unworkable. It fell to Lew, one of the secretaries-general of the Asian Relations Organization, to announce the cancellation of the second ARO conference, scheduled to be held in China in 1949. Months later, the Chinese IPR itself withdrew from the international IPR. Hu Shih's formal, anodyne letter cited "the cumulative effect of many years of disagreement on matters of policy and opinion" as the reason for the termination of their relationship.[37] Holland accepted the Chinese withdrawal with regret but without surprise. Although IPR officials attempted to keep some unofficial Chinese contacts alive in the 1950s, the revolution effectively put an end to the IPR's 25-year-old presence in China.

---

[34] *Ibid.*
[35] Dorothy Borg to W.L. Holland, Feb. 9, 1949, in Box 318, "Borg, Dorothy," Pacific Relations, COL.
[36] Daniel Lew to W.L. Holland, Aug. 19, 1949, in Box 319, "Chinese Council," Pacific Relations, COL.
[37] Hu Shih to Huntington Gilchrist (Chairman, Pacific Council), Sept. 18, 1950, in Box 325, "Chinese Council," Pacific Relations, COL.

The Lucknow Conference, 1950

The loss of the Chinese IPR council was a major setback for Pacific internationalists, but the re-admittance of the Japanese IPR caused more immediate problems regarding the next international conference. The Australian Institute of International Affairs and the Philippines Institute of Pacific Relations had been vying to host the next international IPR conference, an occasion that promised to confer heightened prestige and publicity upon the selected national council. But with memories of the war still fresh in the spring of 1949, neither country's government was prepared to issue visas to Japanese delegates. The secretary of the Australian Institute, R.F.G. Boyer, indicated that any Japanese delegation would be *persona non grata* for the Australian government and its people, and advised holding the conference without the Japanese, a decision supported by the New Zealand council. Conrado Benitez of the Philippine IPR similarly reported ongoing national feelings of "deep resentment" and "disgust" toward the Japanese, made worse by the recent decision by the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) to deny war reparations to the Philippines. Benitez agreed with the assessment of Philippine Ambassador to the United States Carlos Romulo, who privately warned that the Philippine government could not guarantee the safety of potential Japanese delegates. Faced with this opposition, other councils questioned whether the not-yet-independent Japanese should even have a council with full member status.[38]

At a New York meeting of the IPR's Pacific Council in January 1949, leaders of the various national councils met to decide the troublesome issue of Japanese

---

[38] R.F.G. Boyer to Huntington Gilchrist, June 2, 1949; Conrado Benitez to W.L. Holland, May 17, 1949; R.G. Powles to Huntington Gilchrist, May 23, 1949; all in Box 326, "Eleventh Conference Site," Pacific Relations, COL.

participation in the next international conference. Australia, supported by New Zealand, France and Britain, continued to press its case for hosting the meeting, saying that IPR members already had provisionally accepted the idea at Stratford in 1947. Edward Carter, on the cusp of retirement from the American IPR, ostensibly pressed for the Philippines, with support from India and China. Chatham House officials, however, already suspected that Carter's real aim was to promote India as an Asian host who would permit the Japanese—Carter's "last kick," as Ivison Macadam put it.[39] Carter intimated that the failure of the IPR to secure a conference site in Asia would essentially put them out of business as an Asian regional organization, but that he was "happy" to report that the Asian Relations Organization might be able to take up some of the work that the IPR had abdicated. This mild rebuke worked, and Carter eventually got his way. Working behind the scenes throughout the summer of 1949, IPR officials successfully wooed the Indians to agree to host the next international gathering in the fall of 1950.

The decision to have the IPR's international conference in India brought, once again, considerable international prestige and attention to the Indian Council of World Affairs. By the eve of Indian independence in 1947, it became clear that the ICWA had consolidated its status as the pre-eminent institute of international affairs in India, confirmed by its successful coordination of the Asian Relations Conference. The American IPR delegation to the September 1947 Stratford conference strongly urged fellow delegates to recognize the ICWA as the IPR's national council in India—a plea to which the British acquiesced only after hearing that members of the Indian Institute of International Affairs, the more Chatham House-friendly organization, largely had transplanted themselves to Pakistan, where they intended to carry on their work as the Pakistan Institute of International Affairs. Both were thus accorded membership into the

---

[39] Ivison Macadam to E.J. Tarr, Oct. 3, 1947, CHA 6/2/61, RIIA.

IPR at the same time. The more-powerful and better-organized Indians, however, made it clear that they now expected greater consideration; P.S. Lokanathan, the ICWA's executive secretary, wrote to William Holland that his group was now "a tough adult product" and said Chatham House was "unwise … to have treated it like an infant."[40] One American IPR member in India noted that the ICWA's burgeoning international reputation made them powerful enough that they did not need to woo the IPR for affiliation; rather, the IPR, in need of Asian membership and support, now must come to them.[41]

As the October 1950 conference drew near, it became clear that this IPR gathering had the potential for much greater contentiousness and wider impact than the previous international conference in Great Britain in 1947. For one, this IPR conference was the first to be held in an Asian country since 1931, reducing the numbers of Westerners prepared to travel for the 10-day gathering. Despite the recent loss of the Chinese council, many more Asian voices now participated in the IPR: delegations arrived from India, Pakistan, and Japan, while guest observers came from Burma, Malaya, Vietnam and newly independent Indonesia. Second, international circumstances heightened the drama: the Korean War erupted a few months before the conference began, crystallizing the debate over Western interference in Asia. Third, IPR leaders decided to widen the scope of the conference to encompass not only economic development, but broader political considerations: the working theme was "Nationalism in the Far East and its International Consequences." Finally, in a departure from past IPR practice, Institute officials opened up many of the round-table discussions to reporters in an attempt to

---

[40] P.S. Lokanathan to W.L. Holland, Sept. 25, 1947, in Box 309, "Indian Institute of International Relations," Pacific Relations, COL.
[41] William C. Johnstone to Edward C. Carter, Aug. 25, 1947, in Box 220, "International Secretariat – Pacific Council," Pacific Relations, COL.

garner greater publicity for the group. As a result the daily proceedings of the conference were well covered by the international press.

More than three eventful years after the 1947 Asian Relations Conference, the IPR set itself the daunting task of evaluating the state of Asian nationalism over the two-week conference in the northern Indian city of Lucknow. And just as he did three years before at the Asian Relations Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru, now India's prime minister, opened the proceedings at the IPR's eleventh international conference on the morning of October 3, 1950. Nehru noted that he had been a long-time supporter of the IPR, and remarked that the international organization was "particularly situated" to help enable Westerners to better understand Asia, as well as Asians to understand the West. The core of much contemporary misunderstanding between these two groups was over the subject of nationalism, he noted. If anything, Nehru himself appeared more, not less, concerned about the impact of nationalism in post-colonial Asia:

> In the case of a country under foreign domination, it is easy to describe what nationalism is. It is anti-foreign power. But, in a free country, what is nationalism? Certainly it is something positive, though opinions may vary. Even so, I think a large element of it is negative, and sometimes we find that nationalism, which is a healthy force in a country, a progressive force, a liberating force, becomes—maybe after liberation—unhealthy, retrogressive, reactionary or expansionist and looks with greedy eyes on other countries, as did those countries against which it fought for its freedom.

Nationalism was simply a fact in postwar Asia, Nehru concluded—a condition that politicians should do their best to control in order that larger feelings of empathy can result, as opposed to the encouragement of prejudice and exclusion.[42]

Unlike the earlier Asian Relations Conference, which dealt with the problems of Asian nationalism in the context of wider regional affiliation, Nehru was speaking before

---

[42] Jawaharlal Nehru, Opening Address, Oct. 3, 1950, in William L. Holland, ed., *Asian Nationalism and the West: A Symposium Based on Documents and Reports of the Eleventh Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations* (New York: Macmillan, 1953), pp. 349-356.

an IPR audience concerned about how to reconcile Asian nationalism and the West. The problem had only been exacerbated by the onset of the Cold War. Were Asian interests inherently different from those of the West? Recent history had created something that could be defined as an "Asian sentiment," Nehru believed, but this masked enormous differences in history and culture among the peoples of Asia. Furthermore, he asserted that the flowering of an Asian sentiment did not necessarily mean that West and East were somehow natural antagonists. "Personally I do not set much weight on this belief of an Orient and an Occident as if there were a basic difference between what is called Occident and what is called Orient," Nehru said.[43] His speech underlined the basic philosophy that had girded the IPR for the past 25 years—that dialogue and reconciliation across the Pacific was possible, that Asia and the West could find common ground.

The lofty idealism of Nehru's opening address came under attack in the several days of discussion that followed. Early in the conference the British delegation dismissed the very notion of an "international society" that existed outside the interests of individual nation-states, and preferred that the conference discussion be focused entirely on considerations of trade and power. Appealing to Nehru-style internationalism, they claimed, was merely an "illicit abstract" that served to confuse rather than clarify the very real difficulties between the nations of the world.[44] This realist view of world affairs, based upon the recognition of clashing national interests, served as a cold splash of water on many of the older internationalists at the gathering. Understanding differences was deemed more important than finding commonalities.

Others claimed that in the fight against communism, promoting differences between nations might have greater utility than attempting to forge a common world

[43] *Ibid*., p. 350.
[44] William L. Holland, ed., *Asian Nationalism and the West,* pp. 385-403.

view. Some argued that there was a basic intellectual problem confronting the democratic nations of the word: Communism had been left unchallenged as a world ideology. Could intellectuals in Asia and the West work together to develop such a common ideology? Perhaps this was not necessary, some delegates suggested. While many Western countries had joined together in the fight against communism, Asian nationalism—directed primarily against Western imperialism—prevented any shared ideology from taking root. Michael Straight, the editor of *The New Republic* who acted as a reporter for the IPR political roundtable, summarized one discussion:

> It was suggested that the objectives set for common action may be totally different for the nations of the West, and for the West and Asia. Military and economic necessities make integration the task of the Western nations. Integration in turn compels a recognition of a common ideology. In the relations of the West and Asia however the objective is cooperation rather than integration. The need for a common ideology is consequently less. It may be that far from searching for a single doctrine of universal application, our task is to stress the diversity of those nations, and to attack communist ideology precisely for its insistence that there can be one doctrine, one state, one party, one method for organizing society which is right for all peoples.[45]

The emphasis upon *diversity* as an argument against communism was becoming an effective rhetorical tool in the Western argument against Soviet-style imperialism, but in this case, it also served to undermine the larger project of reconciling East and West.

If the Lucknow conference discussions confirmed the differences between "East" and "West," it also confirmed a new representative of the West: the United States. Asian delegates made clear that they no longer viewed the United States as the benevolent supporter of Asian independence, but rather as the inheritors of fellow Westerners' colonial policies. So while some Western delegates urged newly independent Asian

[45] Michael Straight, rapporteur, Round Table D – Political Problems, Oct. 9-12, 1950, in Box 472, "Conference Documents – Lucknow 1950," Pacific Relations, COL.

countries to move beyond the legacy of their colonial past,[46] Asian delegates pushed back and declared they simply did not believe that the age of imperialism was over. Many of these delegates articulated a view of imperialism that included economic rather than formal control, and which implicated primarily the United States rather than their former colonial masters.[47] Asian delegates at various times lobbed a series of accusations: the United States had extended its military bases too far into Asia, was preparing to fight the Soviet Union on Asian soil, was willing to use the atom bomb in Asia but not in Europe, and regarded Asian life as expendable in wartime. Furthermore, Asian delegates accused the United States of leading the United Nations into Korea based on narrow strategic self-interest, and that Americans were prepared to extend economic aid to Asia only if Asians subordinated their foreign policy to that of the United States.

The blunt criticism of American policies clearly rattled the U.S. delegates, who found themselves in the novel position of attorneys defending "the West" rather than promoting Asian freedom as they had done at previous IPR gatherings. After one early session, an American delegate told a reporter: "Back home I was considered something of a leftist, but here I feel as if I am on the extreme right."[48] Another American during a political round-table discussion said that the West had been put unfairly into a no-win situation, and described the intertwined set of paradoxes for American policymakers: if the West gave aid, Asians would claim economic imperialism, but if it withheld aid, Asians would denounce indifference. Likewise, if the West established military bases, Asians would complain about expansionism, but if it did not, other forms of aggression

---

[46] One British delegate offered that President Harry S Truman was an honest representative of the American people "without an imperialist idea in his head." Robert North, rapporteur, Round Table C – East Asia, Oct. 4-7, 1950, in *Ibid.*

[47] The Asian critique of a "new form of imperialism" anticipated the theory of "informal empire," which would soon be promoted by the British imperial historians Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher in their essay, "The Imperialism of Free Trade," *Economic History Review,* Vol. 6, No. 1 (1953): 1-15.

[48] Robert Trumball, "Indians Jab at U.S. in Far East Talks," *New York Times*, Oct. 7, 1950.

might arise. Finally, if the West aided progressive Asian politicians, Asians would condemn such political interference, yet if it did nothing, the West would be accused of siding with the forces of repression and the status quo. "In other words," the American delegate concluded, "we are damned if we do and damned if we don't."[49] Americans at Lucknow learned quickly the consequences of being the regional hegemon.

Perhaps because of the frank exchanges among delegates, IPR officials and their backers alike expressed satisfaction with the results of the Lucknow conference. William Holland wrote several people that he felt that the conference had been the most successful IPR gathering since at least 1936 due to the equal numbers of Western and Asian delegates. Holland felt that the debates, while sometimes contentious, were not as ill-tempered as many news reports implied.[50] Roger Evans, Willits' deputy at the Rockefeller Foundation, attended the conference himself and reported that given the emotional context of the ongoing Korean conflict, the IPR method "rose to the test remarkably well." Evans was also particularly hopeful that the Lucknow conference might give a lift to Asian councils in need of strengthening.[51] Finally, one of the American delegates, Carl Spaeth, the dean of Stanford Law School, noted in a lecture upon his return to the United States that the conference's ability to air criticisms of the West in a tolerant atmosphere revealed the IPR's very strengths. Spaeth quoted Ray Lyman Wilbur, the recently deceased Stanford University chancellor and longtime IPR supporter, who had spoken at the 1927 Stanford commencement about the effectiveness of such gatherings: "To see yourself as others see you, to view your own country through

---

[49] Holland, ed., *Asian Nationalism and the West*, p. 387.

[50] "Mr. Holland's Comments on the Lucknow Conference," Minutes of Executive Meeting, American Institute of Pacific Relations, Dec. 6, 1950, in Box 324, "AMCO – New York Minutes of Executive Meeting," Pacific Relations, COL.

[51] Roger F. Evans to Clayton Lane, Nov. 1, 1950, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 352, Folder 4196, RAC.

the questioning eyes of foreign neighbors, is a chastening and wholesome experience and one that millions must undergo if we are to deal successfully across the great ocean."[52]

Twenty-five years after the founding of the IPR, however, many Americans preferred to be validated rather than chastened. News reports during the Lucknow conference created a stir in the United States when they noted the IPR's facilitation of anti-American sentiment at a prominent international forum. George Langdon, writing in the conservative periodical *The Freeman*, lambasted the conference as a "sustained anti-American orgy of oratory and debate." Langdon asked, rhetorically: Why did Asians have such a distorted view of American motivations? His unsurprising answer was that the IPR itself was to blame. "Asia has been learning about United States policy from the same 'experts' who have been telling the American people what to think and do about Asia," he wrote. Langdon attacked the very root of the IPR's mission—to see beyond one's national perspective—by asserting that American experts on Asia should be obliged to express "an American point of view, dictated by the interests of the security of the United States … ." But instead, these American experts on Asia appeared to enjoy the abuses rained down on the United States. Perhaps it was time, Langdon suggested, that Asians tried harder to understand the "wholly unmysterious" United States, rather than have Americans delving into the "mysticism" of Asia.[53]

Such complaints were not merely lodged in anti-communist magazines, but were brought to the front door of the IPR's principal backers. The Lucknow conference proceedings in India had barely ended when Jay Lovestone—the former general secretary of the Communist Party USA in the 1920s who had become executive secretary of the staunchly anti-communist Free Trade Union Committee—scheduled a lunch with Joseph

---

[52] Carl B. Spaeth, "The Lucknow Conference – India and the U.S.," Dec. 1950, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 358, Folder 4249, RAC.

[53] George Langdon, "At the Old Stand," *The Freeman*, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 361, Folder 4276, RAC.

H. Willits, the social sciences director of the Rockefeller Foundation, in New York City. Lovestone showed Willits an anonymous report from Lucknow that called the conference an "abysmal failure" because "many of the Asian delegates, particularly our all-knowing Indian delegates, went out of their way to be rude to the American and Canadian representatives spitting out of the corners of mouth chants of 'Wall Street capitalism,' 'American Imperialism,' "Hands Off Korea' and what-not." Lovestone reiterated his point in a note to the Rockefeller officer a few days later: "No good can come out of the Institute of Pacific Relations in the future," he warned Willits, who had just managed to negotiate financial support to the IPR for another two years. "Entirely as a friend I say to you that in continuing to support this institute, your Foundation is running a grave risk of losing considerable prestige."[54] Friendly or otherwise, the prediction was sound.

By 1950, the Institute of Pacific Relations had successfully transformed itself into an international body that balanced Western and Asian viewpoints at its conferences. The strong presence of Indian and Pakistani voices (and the reintroduction of the Japanese IPR) meant that critics no longer could claim the Institute was merely a propaganda tool for the West.[55] The Lucknow conference, in particular, featured Asian delegates openly speaking out against American regional policies. The fact that the conference took place amid the Korean War only heightened the stakes for finding frank and honest discussion. But what the IPR gained in international stature was also a potential stumbling block in the United States. Americans were little accustomed to accusations of "imperialism," especially at a conference that was largely supported by

---

[54] Jay Lovestone to Joseph Willits, Oct. 16, 1950; Willits to Lovestone, Oct. 17, 1950; Lovestone to Willits, Oct. 24, 1950; all in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 358, Folder 4247, RAC.

[55] The Soviet Union's official news agency, TASS, claimed that IPR, "one of the unofficial channels by which American imperialism exercises influence over the Asian countries," had utterly failed in its attempt to "hoodwink" the Asian peoples. "Soviet reports on the Lucknow conference," copies of translated TASS reports, Oct. 7, 1950 and Oct. 26, 1950, in Box 8, Folder 3, Edward C. Carter papers, University of Vermont (UVM), Burlington.

U.S. philanthropic and corporate support. Even more worrisome for the Institute was the fallout from the "loss" of China to communism in 1949. Asia specialists in the IPR had criticized Chiang for years, but their connections to the American diplomatic establishment made the independent organization a ripe target for Senator Joseph McCarthy's broader attacks on American policy in China. For the rest of the IPR's life, it would be dogged by the accusations of communist sympathy, even as some of its leaders reiterated their mission to become potential allies in the struggle to win Asian minds.

Chapter Five

"Machinations": The IPR and the McCarthy Moment, 1950-1952

Over a quarter-century, the Institute of Pacific Relations had built a reputation in the United States as an objective and non-partisan research organization. Within the course of a few months, this reputation shattered amid public accusations of communist infiltration. In the wake of the "loss" of China to the communists in 1949, Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-Wisc.) and his allies labeled the American IPR a communist front organization, and charged that the group, through its supposedly shadowy influence within the State Department, was largely responsible for the recent failures in U.S. Far Eastern policy. In early 1951, Senate Judiciary Chairman Pat McCarran (D-Nev.) launched hearings into the IPR's alleged violation of the Internal Security Act, and overnight, the American council was thrust into the limelight, its programs and personnel dissected in the national media for evidence of subversive activity. During the course of the McCarran subcommittee hearings, a few ex-staffers refused to answer questions regarding past association with the communist party—sufficient evidence for some to cast doubt on the entire Institute. In the wake of the hearings, Senator McCarran went so far to conclude that "but for the machinations of the small group … China today would be free."[1] Individual American IPR members and prominent backers quickly retreated from public support, leaving the American council in a precarious state of affairs, a situation from which it would never fully recover.

Scholars of postwar American politics have documented the way in which anti-communist politicians used the IPR to bludgeon the State Department over its foreign

[1] Quoted in John N. Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974), p. 94.

policy in Asia.[2] Studies have concluded that despite the charges, the Institute was not parroting a pro-communist line, nor did it directly influence American foreign policy in East Asia. Most of the top leaders of the American IPR, moreover, were not especially sympathetic to the Soviet Union—or if they were, they did not let their personal feelings affect the Institute's work. John N. Thomas, in the only book-length treatment of the IPR during the McCarthy era, concluded that there was no evidence that a communist cell operated in the IPR which might have influenced the Institute's research agenda, publication record or conference proceedings. Thomas nevertheless was critical of IPR leaders for not being more sensitive to the changing political climate in the United States and asserting a stronger anti-communist stance—a contention that this chapter challenges. Furthermore, although Thomas generally has exonerated the IPR from its senatorial inquisitors, he focused his study exclusively upon the American council, and thus failed to consider the IPR's larger international considerations in their response to critics. IPR leaders, presiding over a dozen national councils, had more than just an American constituency to satisfy. This chapter thus places the McCarthyist moment in the context of the IPR's role as a liaison between institutes of international affairs in Europe, North America, and Asia, and asks broader questions: What implications might these charges have on the IPR as an actor in international relations? And to what extent did the McCarthyist moment impact the Western struggle for Asian minds?

Leaders of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, this chapter argues, were trapped in a double bind during the McCarthy era. An embrace of strident anti-communism may have placated some domestic critics, but it did nothing to convince Asian intellectuals to accept the IPR as a truly independent forum in international relations. They were caught, in other words, between the need to bolster support in the

[2] The best work on the McCarthy moment in American history is David M. Oshinsky, *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy* (New York: The Free Press, 1983).

United States and the need to bolster Asian membership in the international Institute. Their troubles did not end there, however. To win support at home, the American IPR needed to assert its role in furthering the national interest, and at the same time convince the American public of the utility of free and open international exchange based on the IPR model—even if that exchange might lead to scathing criticism of the United States, such as that expressed at the October 1950 conference in Lucknow, India. The American IPR's high wire act was precarious even before the McCarran hearings began; once the Institute lost its balance in the public eye, it found it impossible to climb back up.

This chapter makes clear that Senators McCarthy and McCarran's attacks upon the Institute of Pacific Relations did not simply weaken the free exchange of ideas among American scholars, but also had the ironic effect of compromising the project of constructing a "Free Asia." By the late 1940s, Institute leaders in the United States recognized that they needed to project a stronger adherence to anti-communism in order to be considered a fully "objective" research organization by State Department officials and the American public at large—a contradiction in itself that only a few older members noticed. The Institute's belated move to the right, however, was insufficient to inoculate itself against the onslaught of the McCarthyist campaign during this period. By focusing on the IPR's older record, Senators McCarthy and McCarran revealed themselves to be more interested in discrediting the U.S. State Department and its past policies toward Asia rather than truly understanding the IPR's potentially positive utility as a private organization with links to non-communist Asia. In falsely blaming the IPR for the "loss" of China to the communists, McCarthy and McCarran undermined the Institute's ability to remain a robust international organization that could encourage and coordinate non-communist Asian intellectuals.

ANTI-COMMUNISM AND THE AMERICAN IPR

One of the many ironies involved in the story of the IPR is that by the time of the McCarran hearings in 1951, the American council—as distinct from the international secretariat—already had transformed itself into a staunchly anti-communist entity. It had done so largely as a matter of practical necessity. As a private organization, the American IPR was beholden to the support of financial contributors—foundations, corporations and individuals—who of course were not immune to the onset of the Cold War. American IPR officials also were aware of the need to maintain dialogue with the U.S. foreign policy establishment, which grew ever more anti-communist in the several months after the close of World War II. The postwar perception of the American council may have been that of an unrepentant, wooly-minded internationalist organization from the 1930s, but in important ways, it had grown to reflect the dominant ideas in American society by the end of the 1940s.

As relations with the Soviet Union deteriorated, American IPR leaders began to recognize that their non-judgmental approach to foreign affairs might have serious consequences for their viability within the new Cold War climate. At the American council's national conference in April 1947 in Coronado, California, about 100 participants, including State Department specialists in Asian and Pacific affairs, spent time evaluating American foreign policy in Asia. The government officials were highly dubious of the American IPR's openness in its research agenda and conference debates, which they felt might be vulnerable to communist infiltration. In a memo to State Department colleagues, conference attendee Robert Barnett (a former IPR member himself) questioned whether the American group was an "objective, disinterested, competent" organization that could hold an "honest discussion of the facts of the Far

East, upon which American foreign policy must be based."[3] One of Barnett's colleagues, J.M. Allison, noted that some American council members were openly critical of the recently issued Truman Doctrine, and thus "adopted a line which could only have been of 'aid and comfort' to the Soviet Union … there was little or no effort to support the established policy of our Government."[4] Barnett and Allison's memoranda implied the new rules of the game: failure to praise American foreign policy objectives, even by an independent organization such as the American IPR, would be considered a potentially subversive activity. Well before Senators McCarthy and McCarran launched their investigations, the American diplomatic establishment already was beginning to question the IPR's commitment to the anti-communist cause.

State Department officials were not alone in their worries about the relative lack of strident anti-communism within the American IPR; West Coast branches of the national council pressed hard at the April 1947 meeting for the purging of all "red" elements within the New York leadership. Their ire largely fell upon one man: Frederick Vanderbilt Field, the wealthy leftist described a few years later by a *Saturday Evening Post* profile as "America's Millionaire Communist."[5] Field, a direct descendent of the railroad magnate Cornelius Vanderbilt, had served as the executive secretary of the American council in the 1930s and was a major financial contributor to the IPR, but his increasingly radical political affiliations had become a growing distraction for the Institute. In 1940, Field became executive director of American Peace Mobilization, a leftist group that picketed the White House against U.S. involvement in World War II but then dropped its concerns after the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941.

---

[3] R.W. Barnett, "Coronado National Conference of American IPR," April 15, 1947, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 811.43 Institute of Pacific Relations/4-1847, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.
[4] Barnett, Memorandum; J.M. Allison, Memorandum, April 18, 1947, in *Ibid.*
[5] Craig Thomson, "America's Millionaire Communist," *The Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 9, 1950.

During the war Field left his position as an AIPR staff member but continued to serve on the Board of Trustees, even as he wrote regular articles in the publications *New Masses* and the *Daily Worker*. Then-IPR secretary-general Edward Carter, however, considered Field a friend, and defended his participation in the Institute as a sign of the group's open-mindedness. But as grumblings from conservative West Coast members grew louder, Field reluctantly offered his resignation from the American council's board in the summer of 1947.[6] The most notable communist sympathizer in the American IPR thus departed from the organization.

Another dramatic personnel change came in the summer of 1948 with the selection of a known anti-communist, Clayton Lane, as the new executive secretary of the American council. Carter had served as temporary head of the American group since his 1946 ouster from the international secretariat, but the American IPR executive committee now decided it wished to appoint the less controversial Lane, a former mid-level State Department official, as the top officer on the American council. In conversations with leading American council members, former top State Department figures like Leo Pasvolsky[7] endorsed Lane with enthusiasm, while Dean Rusk, then deputy undersecretary of state in charge of Far Eastern Affairs, assured AIPR officials that Lane was not only capable and reliable but thoroughly "secure."[8] The implication was clear: American IPR members did not need to worry about the possibility of critics tarring Lane with communist sympathy as they had with Field and even Carter. The selection of Lane also

---

[6] Field's resignation letter was both angry and prophetic about the AIPR's coming difficulties: "As I have said before, I do not think that my resignation will solve the organization's problems, and I am quite certain that my withdrawal is being brought about by a procedure which is the very antithesis of the democratic method." Field to Carter, July 23, 1947, in Box 306, "AMCO – New York," Pacific Relations, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

[7] An economist by training, Pasvolsky served as a member of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Post-War Policy during World War II, and was head of the State Department's Division of Special Research.

[8] W.L. Holland to E.C. Carter, July 9, 1948, in Box 231, "Carter, Edward – General," Pacific Relations, COL.

meant that the American IPR would strengthen ties with the Cold War Washington diplomatic community. Rusk went so far as to suggest that Lane might undertake joint short-term assignments in Asia on behalf of the State Department and the IPR, thereby saving the Institute travel money and making double use of Lane's time "in the field." Although no evidence has been found to suggest that such trips took place, the suggestion alone indicated the restoration of confidence and even coordination between top governmental leaders in Washington and the American council, not seen since the close of the war.[9]

Upon his elevation to the top administrative post within the American IPR in the fall of 1948, Clayton Lane decided to go on the offense. He began to reassure critics not only that the Institute was clear of any communist influences, but also that it was in fact actively working *against* communism. Lane sent an open letter to the editors of *Counterattack*, an anti-communist newsletter previously critical of the American IPR, in which he baldly courted the approval of the red-baiting publication. "Your emphasis is on defeating Communist and Soviet purposes in the United States," Lane wrote. "Our emphasis will be on Asia with the same end in view." But upon reading this letter, some American IPR members were taken aback by Lane's desire to use the Institute as a political weapon. Laurence Salisbury, the former editor of the American IPR quarterly journal *Far Eastern Survey*, promptly resigned his membership, noting that he especially objected to Lane's characterization of the Institute's work as a form of "combat" in the Cold War. Salisbury wrote to the now-retired Edward Carter, explaining his decision to resign. "The only way to 'combat' communism, as far as AIPR is concerned, in my opinion, is to spread accurate knowledge of the Far East, but 'combat' is scarcely a word

[9] "Visit to Washington, Sept. 12-15," Clayton Lane memorandum to AIPR executive and finance committees, Sept. 19, 1949, in Box 318, "AMCO – New York Minutes of Executive Meeting," Pacific Relations, COL.

to be used in relation to a research organization," Salisbury fumed. "It associates the organization with the bias of the extreme right which is riding successfully for the moment on the bad relations of the US and the USSR."[10] Lane's efforts to shore up conservative support for the American IPR risked alienating older liberal stalwarts of the group like Salisbury and Carter. In fact, the following lines of unsigned doggerel found among Edward Carter's papers suggest that the former leader himself was becoming disaffected with the American group's open embrace of anti-communism:

> Here rests its elbow on the quaking ground
> An Institute, to fame (not fortune) known;
> Upon its humble birth some people frowned
> And having come to frown, remained to groan.
>
> Large was its purpose and its balance deft
> Until at length it was too sorely tried –
> When someone cried, "You're leaning to the left"
> It toppled down upon the other side.
>
> Seek not its future further to disclose
> Nor prophesy its most untimely end;
> Await what trust its members may impose
> And what Carnegie thinks it fit to send.[11]

The American IPR's move to the right may have frustrated some older liberal members, but Lane understood that it was critical to regain the backing not only among Washington's foreign policy elite, but also among financial supporters, especially the Carnegie Corporation and Rockefeller Foundation, to reassure them that the American council had completed its "house cleaning" of resident leftists. In this spirit, Lane authorized special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct a

[10] Carter confidentially passed along Salisbury's letter to William Holland, who returned it with a brief but telling reply: "Thanks. I'd heard about his decision. I don't blame him." Larry Salisbury to Edward Carter, Dec. 24, 1948, in Box 7, Folder 15, Edward C. Carter papers, University of Vermont archives (UVM), Burlington.
[11] "Elegy in a City Boneyard," n.d., in Box 8, Folder 3, Carter papers, UVM.

comprehensive examination of the American IPR's records and publications found in the New York headquarters, while secretary-general William Holland agreed to a parallel FBI examination of the international secretariat's files. During the course of three weeks in the summer of 1950, Lane reviewed all of the extracted material and participated in several voluntary interviews with six FBI agents. From this experience he wrote up a confidential report to the Rockefeller Foundation with his candid appraisal of the Institute's past. In his report Lane noted that while the IPR had been dominated by leaders with "left-liberal" views, he concluded that the group had not been used as an instrument of communist or Soviet propaganda. Lane confided that he would have dropped Field from the American IPR's Board of Trustees well before 1947, but he found no indication that Field used his position for subversive purposes. Lane also commented on Edward Carter, and concluded that the former secretary-general was not a communist, but simply "naïve about the Russians, and a persistent and sentimental advocate of fuzzily liberal views … unwise, but not disloyal." Carter's successor, Holland, on the other hand, had "vastly more stability and common sense … without him, there would be no IPR." Lane finally noted that IPR personnel in general fell within the same ideological spectrum of any other research-oriented group; if the IPR were "unsound," he wrote, then so too must be the majority of American newspapers, magazines and universities.[12]

With Lane and Holland at the helm, foundation officials were reassured of the IPR's loyalty, but the larger question of the Institute's value confronted them as they evaluated its funding appeals in 1949 and 1950. On this front, the IPR was fighting an uphill battle; the Carnegie Corporation and Rockefeller Foundation, which often had

[12] Clayton Lane, Memorandum on the Institute of Pacific Relations, Sept. 5, 1950, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 352, Folder 4196, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.

comprised more than half of the IPR budget, had announced at the end of World War II that they were beginning to scale back their general support of independent institutes of international relations and instead concentrate their efforts on university-based programs.[13] As large foundations became more hesitant to offer funds, so too did corporate backers. This situation developed to a point that by 1950, the American IPR was facing critical financial peril. Lane urged the Rockefeller Foundation to make an exceptional grant in order to give the IPR time to broaden its base of support. Dozens of letters poured in to the Rockefeller Foundation attesting to the IPR's value, including from Ambassador at Large Philip Jessup, Deputy Undersecretary of State Dean Rusk, Great Britain's Lord Hailey, Ralph Bunche of the United Nations, Indian Ambassador Madame Pandit, as well as several university presidents.[14] The American council pointed to new $2,500 grants from corporations like Chase Bank, National City Bank, Standard Vacuum Co. and International General Electric, as well as significant individual contributions. The effort finally paid off. At a meeting of the Rockefeller Foundation's executive committee on September 22, 1950, officers agreed to a $60,000 one-year grant to the American IPR, as well as $50,000 to the international IPR to be used over the course of two years—a life-preserver that would sustain the group as its political troubles deepened.[15]

Significantly, it was the IPR's unique international role that appeared to serve as the pivotal argument in keeping the American group alive. Rather than create an entirely new organization, Rockefeller Foundation officials concluded that "it is better to utilize

---

[13] Joseph Willits, "Postwar Policy in the Support of International Relations," May 1945, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 3, Series 910, Box 8, Folder 67, RAC.

[14] For copies of letters, see Paul F. Hooper, "The McCarthy Era and the Financial Crisis of the Institute of Pacific Relations: Key Documents and Letters of Support," in Michio Yamaoka and George M. Oshiro, eds., *Towards the Construction of a New Discipline: International Conference Proceedings on the Re-evaluation of the Institute of Pacific Relations* (Tokyo: Ronsosha, 2005), pp. 213-258.

[15] Questions and answers to be presented to the Executive Committee of the RF [Rockefeller Foundation] by JHW [Joseph H. Willits], Sept. 22, 1950, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 357, Folder 4246, RAC.

the mechanism that exists and which has working cooperation from many countries rather than to have to rebuild from the ground up. … If the IPR is killed, there is no insurance of essential cooperation from Asiatic countries."[16] With this latest show of support, Rockefeller officers demonstrated their hope that the IPR would remain an important medium for private intellectual exchange across the Pacific. While their statement may not have exuded much confidence, the Rockefeller Foundation's decision to make this extraordinary grant was particularly courageous in the fall of 1950. By that time, the IPR was being placed directly in the crosshairs of an effort to discredit them and the entire diplomatic establishment over the troubled American policy in Asia.

MCCARTHY AND THE "CHINA LOBBY"

On February 8, 1950, in a speech in Wheeling, West Virginia, Senator Joseph McCarthy boldly charged that political radicals had infiltrated the U.S. State Department over the previous decade and conspired to aid and abet the Chinese Communist Party. McCarthy falsely claimed to have in his hand a list of 205 known communists who were still working for the State Department—a number that would fluctuate wildly in the coming weeks, as journalists pressed him for evidence. The Republican senator's charges may have been broad and undefined, but they struck a nerve with the American public, who had watched in dismay as the Chinese Communist Party overran mainland China in the summer of 1949. Not wishing McCarthy to control the anti-communist issue, the Democratic leadership of the Senate announced that they would form a special subcommittee to investigate whether or not the State Department was employing "disloyal" Americans as advisors. The resulting body was known as the Tydings Committee, led by Democratic senator Millard Tydings of Maryland, a strong anti-

[16] *Ibid.*, RAC.

communist but no McCarthy supporter. It was during the Tydings hearings in the spring of 1950 that many Americans were first made aware of the IPR's existence, cast through the conspiratorial lens of McCarthy and his supporters.

McCarthy's public accusations of communist subversion gave new life to the campaign of Alfred Kohlberg, the disgruntled former American IPR member who had previously pressured the Institute to investigate supposed pro-communist bias in its wartime publications. Ever since the American IPR formally denied his allegations of institutional political bias in the spring of 1947, Kohlberg nursed his grievances. Now that McCarthy had gone out on a limb, the senator needed specific evidence to support his claims. Kohlberg pointed out the IPR to McCarthy, indicating that this group should be considered the linchpin of any Far Eastern conspiracy. In a series of meetings in March 1950, Kohlberg provided McCarthy with reams of material on the IPR, furnishing the senator with names as well as selected quotations that suggested a communist "line" by prominent experts on China. McCarthy had been wary of accepting money from Kohlberg, as the latter was already known in the press as the head of the so-called "China Lobby," an informal collection of individuals who had pushed for greater American support of Chiang's nationalist Kuomintang Party. McCarthy did not want to appear beholden to such a group, but behind the scenes, he was happy to use Kohlberg's material, as well as the latter's ideas about the "four stages" of the Communist line on China, to inform his public statements.[17]

During the hastily organized Tydings hearings in late March 1950, McCarthy cited two former IPR leaders—Philip Jessup, the wartime leader of the American council, and Owen Lattimore, the wartime editor of the international IPR journal *Pacific Affairs*—as central figures in his case for a Far Eastern conspiracy. In addition to their IPR duties,

[17] Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, p. 68.

Jessup and Lattimore had served as advisors to the State Department on Far Eastern policy during the war. With sly insinuation, McCarthy claimed Jessup, now serving as U.S. ambassador-at-large, had "an unusual affinity for Communist causes."[18] McCarthy made a much stronger and more direct accusation against Lattimore, the director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at the Johns Hopkins University, the former editor of *Pacific Affairs*, as well as Chiang Kai-shek's American advisor in 1941 and deputy director of Pacific operations for the Office of War Information during World War II. McCarthy now called Lattimore "the top Russian espionage agent" in the United States, and the "boss" of Alger Hiss and other Soviet spies.[19] McCarthy later backtracked slightly, indicating that Lattimore was merely "one of the top" agents, but he nevertheless made it clear that he was willing to "stand or fall" on the outcome of the case against the professor.

In the end, Jessup and Lattimore escaped censure by the Democratic-led Tydings Committee. The well-connected Jessup produced supportive letters by Generals George C. Marshall and Dwight D. Eisenhower, and effectively rebutted the allegations of his supposed membership in communist-front organizations. Lattimore, for his part, lashed out against his accuser, drawing applause from the gallery when he said McCarthy was responsible for "instituting a reign of terror" in the State Department. Lattimore charged that the Wisconsin senator was merely "the dupe of a bitter and implacable and fanatical group of people who will not tolerate any discussion of China which is not based on absolute, total and complete support of the Nationalist Government in Formosa"—people like Alfred Kohlberg and others who were at the core of the so-called China Lobby.[20]

---

[18] Quoted in *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

[19] Quoted in Oshinsky, *A Conspiracy So Immense*, p. 136.

[20] Oshinsky, *A Conspiracy So Immense,* 147-149. Lattimore's account of his time before the Tydings Committee was published later that year. Owen Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander* (Boston, Little, Brown, 1950). Also see Robert P. Newman, *Owen Lattimore and the 'Loss' of China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

The final Tydings report, issued on July 20, 1950, exonerated Jessup and Lattimore of charges of espionage, or even of following a communist "line" in their writings, and repudiated McCarthy's charges. McCarthy clearly had lost the first round in his campaign against these alleged communist conspirators.

Despite the Tydings Committee's official clearance of Jessup and Lattimore, it was not a complete failure for McCarthy; the senator now merely refined his strategy, using information gleaned from the investigation. One witness in particular offered new evidence linking the IPR, Lattimore and the communists: Louis Budenz, a former mid-level member of the Communist Party in the 1930s and 40s. Budenz testified at the Tydings hearings that a communist "cell" had existed in the American Institute of Pacific Relations, and that Lattimore was one of its key members. Jessup, as head of the American IPR during the war, thus either actively or tacitly must have approved of their influence on the Institute's activities. Budenz offered himself to McCarthy as a former party insider who could link Lattimore to a communist conspiracy in a way that Kohlberg could not.

Budenz was a flawed and complicated witness in his own right, with a torturous life story that brought him to be an informant. Born into a Catholic family, Budenz had married a divorced woman as a young man and was subsequently excommunicated from the Church. His dabbling in radical causes over a number of years finally led him to join the Communist Party in 1935, and following a journalistic bent, he eventually served as managing editor of *The Daily Worker* during World War II. But at the end of the war, an emotional encounter with Bishop Fulton J. Sheen inspired him to rejoin the Catholic Church and renounce his former comrades with the religious zeal of the reconverted. Thousands of hours of testimony to the Federal Bureau of Investigation had helped implicate several notable Americans, including the State Department's Alger Hiss.

Although Lattimore's name never appeared in his previous voluminous testimony, Budenz now suddenly placed him at the center of the Far Eastern conspiracy and amplified rumors that this operation was run out of the Institute of Pacific Relations—a gift to the Wisconsin senator.[21]

McCarthy had a star witness in Budenz, but he still lacked concrete evidence of perfidy within the IPR ranks. His staff now sprang into action. Sometime in January 1951, one of McCarthy's top investigators, Donald Surine, heard from a source about some old IPR files stored in the barn of Edward Carter, the retired IPR secretary-general. Sensing an opportunity, Surine didn't bother with legal formalities; he simply drove up to Carter's farmstead in Lee, Massachusetts, broke into the barn, and carried off several thousand documents, which he promptly handed over to McCarthy.[22] The senator looked over these documents with his colleague, Senator Karl E. Mundt (R-S.D.), and while neither registered concern over the blatant illegality of the files' procurement, they did recognize that to pursue the matter, they needed to involve another important Washington legislator: Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nev.). A fellow anti-communist who had just overseen the passage of the Internal Security Act, McCarran was serving both as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee as well as that of the new Senate Internal Security Subcommittee charged with investigating communist subversion. Upon seeing the illegally procured IPR files, McCarran agreed with his Republican counterparts that further investigation was warranted, and quickly issued a subpoena for the rest of the IPR files.

On February 8, 1951, amid a heavy snowstorm, four men in a rented truck drove onto Edward Carter's Massachusetts farm and served McCarran's subpoena for the IPR

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 153.
[22] This account of the seizure of the files is taken from a Sept. 18, 1951 article by Oliver Pilat and William V. Shannon in the *New York Post*, and quoted in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings*, p. 5353.

documents to the farm's caretakers, Mr. and Mrs. James Markham. The Markhams, unable to reach the Carters by telephone and unaware of the previous break-in by Surine, surrendered the key to the barn, despite the lack of a search warrant. By that afternoon, the men took about 75 filing cabinets worth of material, loaded them into the truck, sealed the contents, and drove them directly to the Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C. The seizure of the files effectively covered up Surine's earlier theft, and made for breathless headlines regarding the supposedly "startling" material waiting to be discovered in the hidden cache of "barn files."[23] Over the next few weeks, Senate investigators stoked the speculation by feeding damning document "leaks" to sympathetic newspaper columnists at the Hearst press, including George E. Sokolsky.[24] Not all media outlets were taken in by this ploy; the *San Francisco Chronicle*, for instance, correctly noted that these very files had been made available by Clayton Lane to FBI investigators the year before, with Carter's full permission, and had been pored through without dramatic revelations.[25] Such notes of caution were drowned in the tide of hysteria, however, and the public tarring of the Institute had begun in earnest.

THE MCCARRAN HEARINGS

Senator Pat McCarran grew up a poorly educated Nevada farm boy but now, at 75 years old, he wielded power in the Senate commensurate with his great physical bulk. McCarran was no less obsessed by communists than his Republican colleague McCarthy, and no less willing to pursue them at all costs. McCarran himself openly admitted that

[23] Frank Holeman, "Seized Data From Pacific Institute Reported to Yield 'Startling Leads'," *The News*, Feb. 12, 1951. Among the fodder for the tabloid press was the fact that prominent heiress Doris Duke was considered a "possible 'soft touch' for leftist-inspired causes," including the IPR. "Pacific Group Sought Cash from Doris Duke," *New York Daily Mirror*, Feb. 14, 1951.
[24] Box 10, Folder 11, Carter papers, UVM.
[25] Editorial, "The McCarthy Trail Again," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb. 27, 1951.

his wide-ranging investigations necessarily would sweep up innocents along the way, but saw no reason to modify his approach. He once told a friend: "If I throw up a hundred false balloons, if I make a hundred efforts that fail, if I make a hundred mistakes, and do eventually find that one, I will have served my country well."[26] This kind of scattershot approach obviously had little concern for potential victims along the way. Writing in his memoirs, Frederick Vanderbilt Field lashed out at his tormentor, concluding that "if McCarran wasn't the devil himself, he was his surrogate."[27] Presented with the opportunity to throw up a balloon at the IPR, and always relishing a fight, McCarran did not hesitate to launch hearings into the Institute's activities.

After making an independent examination of the IPR's files and taking secret testimony from several witnesses throughout the spring, the McCarran Committee's public hearings into the IPR finally began in July 1951. McCarran pledged to make the hearings a respectable, fact-finding mission, but scholars have since concluded that McCarran's proceedings were anything but.[28] It is clear from McCarran's line of questioning and his public statements that his opinion of the IPR already was set in place at the outset of the hearings. Before top IPR officials had even been given a chance to rebut the primary charges, McCarran told a magazine reporter: "The IPR was originally an organization with laudable motives. It was taken over by Communist design and made a vehicle for American policy with regard to the Far East. It was also used for espionage purposes to collect and channel information of interest or value to the Russian Communists."[29] Budenz reprised his earlier role as the IPR's chief antagonist, and now

---

[26] Quoted in Michael J. Ybarra, *Washington Gone Crazy: Senator Pat McCarran and the Great American Communist Hunt* (Hanover, NH: Steerforth Press, 2004), p. 8.
[27] Quoted in Ybarra, *Washington Gone Crazy*, p. 574.
[28] The best account of the McCarran hearings can be found in Ybarra, *Washington Gone Crazy*, pp. 569-605. Ybarra, however, is less interested in their impact on the IPR itself, calling the Institute "the nominal subject" of the hearings, which really were geared to target high-level diplomats in the State Department.
[29] *U.S. News and World Report,* Nov. 16, 1951.

he was joined by several other professional ex-communists without any formal connection to the IPR but nevertheless willing to provide hearsay testimony the view that the IPR had been infiltrated by communists.[30] Their accusations were bolstered by the unwillingness of a handful of former American IPR staffers to deny categorically that they had ever been members of the Communist Party.[31] One current staffer, Lawrence Rosinger, invoked his Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination, shocking and dismaying his colleagues.[32] Some of the most damning charges against the IPR, however, came not from ex-communists but from a handful of Asian specialists in universities—political scientists who had become disenchanted with some of the Institute's leaders. The IPR, these scholars claimed, had indeed abandoned an objective, neutral viewpoint and had allowed the Institute to become an organization with a barely concealed political agenda.

McCarran Committee members believed they could find evidence for a communist "line" through a selective, close reading of private IPR correspondence. One of the documents they fastened upon was a June 10, 1938, letter written by Owen Lattimore to Edward Carter, in which Lattimore referred to the ongoing IPR "Inquiry" series into the Sino-Japanese War, and apparently urged the abandonment of neutrality on the subject. "For China, my hunch is that it will pay to keep behind the official Chinese Communist position—far enough not to be covered by the same label—but enough ahead of the active Chinese liberals to be noticeable," he wrote. Lattimore also praised Carter in 1938 as "pretty cagey" in giving research projects to known communist writers in China: "They will bring out the absolutely essential radical aspects, but can be depended

---

[30] Such people included Nathan Silvermaster, Noel Field, Elizabeth Bentley, and Theodore Geiger. U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings,* p. 1218.
[31] Besides Frederick Field, former AIPR staff members who declined to comment on Communist connections included Harriet Moore and Kathleen Barnes.
[32] Rosinger denied to IPR officials that he had ever been a Communist, but he was told that former Communists were willing to testify that he was a member, thus setting up a possible perjury trial.

on to do it with the right touch."[33] McCarran Committee members referred again and again to this so-called "cagey letter" as evidence of a pro-communist conspiracy within the Institute. IPR leaders countered that the people favorably mentioned by Lattimore—Chen Han-seng, Chi Chao-ting, and "Asiaticus" (an anonymous German writer living in China)—never contributed to the Inquiry series.[34] But Lattimore's letter allowed IPR critics to claim that the Institute was at compromised in its avowed dedication to scholarly objectivity. "That … seems to me to be one of the most intellectually dishonest academic documents that I have ever seen," testified Kenneth Colegrove, a Japan expert at Northwestern University who had squabbled with Lattimore for many years.[35] Colegrove had been one of the few AIPR members who had voted for a further internal investigation of Kohlberg's charges in 1947, an effort that failed. Four years later, Lattimore's now-revealed letter merely seemed to confirm Colegrove's suspicions of leftist bias: "This is a complete negation of what the IPR said to professors and teachers all over the country that it was."[36] Coming from a fellow academic and former IPR member, Colegrove's denunciations inflicted extra damage upon the Institute's reputation.

Colegrove's testimony also revived scrutiny of Philip Jessup, the former executive secretary of the American IPR and Board of Trustees member who later went on to serve as Ambassador at Large for the United States in the late 1940s. In the fall of

---

[33] Quoted in U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings*, pp. 915-916.
[34] William Holland, "Documents on Mr. Lattimore's 'Cagey' Letter," April 23, 1952, in Box 10, Folder 8, Carter papers, UVM.
[35] Colegrove had served on the editorial advisory board of *Amerasia*, a journal devoted to American-Asian relations, but resigned in 1943 when the journal began publishing articles attacking British and Dutch colonialism during the war, a position that Lattimore shared. In a subsequent private conversation with Colegrove, Lattimore allegedly asserted his support of the extermination of the Japanese Emperor and his family. When Lattimore offered Colegrove a position with the Office of War Information in San Francisco, Colegrove declined for "personal" reasons: "I did not trust Owen Lattimore. I did not care to be associated with him." U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings,* pp. 907-914.
[36] *Ibid.,* pp. 915-916.

1949, as the Chinese Communists forced Kuomintang forces off the mainland, Ambassador Jessup called together roughly 25 experts on Asia to assess their opinion on American policy toward China. Colegrove, one of the participants at this three-day State Department-sponsored gathering, recalled that IPR associates such as Lattimore and Rosinger were largely in favor of the immediate diplomatic recognition of Communist China, and that this faction "dominated" the conference.[37] Colegrove noted that Jessup did not indicate his inclination on the subject, but that the participants were well known to him, and that he could have anticipated their overall conclusions. The Northwestern University professor claimed to be "surprised" and "disappointed" at the actions of the eminent scholar and jurist, but noted it was not the first time Jessup had shown his political leanings. In late 1948 and early 1949, Jessup gave speeches to the U.N. Security Council critical of Dutch rule in Indonesia and in favor of intervention—speeches that may have exceeded his instructions, according to "a rumor around the State Department," Colegrove said. Criticism of European imperialism, McCarran Committee members noted, tracked with the communist "line."[38]

The testimony regarding Jessup revealed the dishonest line of reasoning on the part of McCarran and his allies in their effort to malign the Institute of Pacific Relations. The personal views of these men could in no way reflect an IPR institutional bias any more than the views of Kohlberg and Colegrove, former American IPR members themselves. But even more troubling was the attempt to elide all differences between expressions of anti-colonialism and espousals of pro-communist ideology. A critique of imperialism was indeed one of the tenets of communism; but those expressing such criticism were not necessarily sympathetic to communism. Could not Jessup and others

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 917-922.
[38] *Ibid.,* pp. 923-924.

have advocated Asian liberation from colonialism with the prospect of a non-communist, democratic future? The Institute's critics rarely considered the possibility. Logic was strained even further when committee members delved into the IPR's correspondence during the war, well before the onset of the Cold War. But while the McCarran Committee did not extend the benefit of the doubt to Lattimore or Jessup, they consistently indulged the conspiratorial fabrications of Budenz and his fellow ex-communists.

Not until October 10, 1951—more than three months after the McCarran hearings began—were IPR officials themselves allowed to defend themselves at length, but even then they still did not have access to their own files. Secretary-General William Holland was the first to respond to his accusers. To supplement his testimony, Holland prepared a 30-page document, "Fact and Fiction about the Institute of Pacific Relations," in which he systematically reviewed the allegations and summarily rejected the idea that it was even possible to have a "line" (communist or otherwise) within an organization that boasted a dozen autonomous national councils that differed sharply with one another, as often revealed at international conferences. "It should never be forgotten that the international IPR is not a unitary, monolithic organization, with national 'branches' controlled by headquarters," Holland wrote. "Any attempt to force this great diversity of views into one philosophical mold or conceptual scheme would be fruitless and ridiculous."[39] He also denied that IPR officials attempted to influence American foreign policy, citing a statement to that effect from Joseph W. Ballantine, the former director of the State Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs.[40] Holland refuted the central myth

---

[39] William L. Holland, "Fact and Fiction About the Institute of Pacific Relations: Statement Presented to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security at a public hearing on October 10, 1951," in Box 10, Folder 1, Carter papers, UVM.

[40] Ballantine's full statement: "During the period that I served in the Department of State I never sought or received any advice on United States Far Eastern policy from the Institute of Pacific Relations; nor am I aware of any attempts being made during that period by the Institute of Pacific Relations to influence

developed by the so-called China Lobby—that a "powerful combine" of interests worked to spread Maoist propaganda in the press, and undermined the nationalist cause in China.[41] Insofar as a general consensus might be discovered in past IPR publications, Holland claimed, it would represent the scholarly opinion of the day, rather than a conspiracy: "The institute reflects such currents; it does not create them."[42]

In the matter of influencing specific American policies in Asia, the Institute of Pacific Relations was a marginal player. But in the larger concern over winning over Asian minds, the group could be of considerable service. The McCarran Committee's hearings, however, threatened to hamper the IPR's ability to keep non-communist Asians in dialogue with the West, as Holland pointed out:

> In most Asian countries [the IPR's] reputation today stands high because it has refused to become a platform for the prevailing views of any one nation, but has tried to remain a forum for the expression of different national attitudes. Strange as it may seem to Americans today, one of the risks that the Institute runs is that its repute among leading non-Communists in Asia may suffer because it is becoming subject too much to the pressures of party politics and to the pressure of pro-Chinese Nationalist groups in the United States.[43]

Holland had seen first-hand the difficulties of convincing Asians that a Western-funded group like the IPR was truly an independent entity. At the October 1950 IPR conference in Lucknow, Indian journalists presented Holland with local newspaper headlines that claimed to offer "irrefutable evidence" that the IPR was a paid agent of the FBI, and that the conference was merely a cover for secret agents to compile dossiers on leading Indian and Pakistani delegates. Holland laughed off the incident at the time, sarcastically remarking that he should send J. Edgar Hoover a bill for $5,000 for the IPR's "invaluable

---

United States foreign policy. May I add that over an even longer period covering my acquaintance with the Institute of Pacific Relations, so far as I know it has consistently adhered to its avowed aim of serving as a non-partisan research agency and to a policy of not engaging in action movements or in sponsoring any particular doctrine or policy." *Ibid*.

[41] The "powerful combine" metaphor was used by Freda Utley, *The China Story* (Chicago: Regnery, 1951).

[42] "Fact and Fiction about the Institute of Pacific Relations," Box 10, Folder 1, Carter papers, UVM.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

services."[44] One year later, however, the specter of the IPR's compromised reputation now was a much graver prospect.

MCCARRAN REPORT AND REACTION

After almost a full year of hearings, the McCarran Committee issued its final report on July 2, 1952. The committee report essentially repeated the accusations of McCarthy and the litany of ex-communists who testified, and predictably ignored Holland and other IPR leaders' statements on their own behalf. The report maintained that the IPR had been "controlled" by a small core of communist sympathizers; that Owen Lattimore and Frederick V. Field used their positions to further Soviet policy; and that the Institute attempted to influence American foreign policy "to affect adversely the interests of the United States." Senator McCarran, when presenting his report to the Senate, went still further, making the breathtaking assertion that "but for the machinations of the small group that controlled and activated that organization, China today would be free and a bulwark against the further advance of the Red hordes into the Far East."[45] Newspaper editorials across the country were divided between those who saw the hearings as pure political theater and others who believed they revealed a cancer at the heart of America's East Asian foreign policy.

Some in the American IPR believed that with the end of the hearings, the Institute could resume its normal functions. Important financial backers remained, such as Standard-Vacuum Oil, General Electric, National City Bank of New York, and the International Telegraph and Telephone Corporation, among others. An appeal to Time, Inc., in late 1951 resulted in a $1,500 donation to the American group, and even *Time-*

---

[44] William L. Holland to Arthur Coons (President, Occidental College), Nov. 21, 1950, in Box 332, "Board of Trustees—Nomination," Pacific Relations, COL.
[45] Quoted in Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, p. 94.

Life's publisher Henry Luce, a long-standing friend of China and former American IPR trustee, personally donated $1,000.[46] The ever-optimistic Edward Carter, long retired from IPR service but still active in its defense, wrote to an old IPR friend that the McCarran hearings perhaps weren't all bad, as the experience had provided the Institute a "status" that former leaders would have gladly paid thousands of dollars to achieve in earlier years. Carter took particular pleasure in hearing about the so-called shared "IPR-State Department line" after he had spent so many years tangling with the American diplomatic community: "It may make Stanley Hornbeck, who is still living, gulp."[47] Ever the promoter, Carter subscribed to the belief that some publicity, however bad, was better than none at all, and said that regardless of its critics, the IPR was now widely considered "an institution of first-rate importance." The hearings, Carter predicted, would cause the American public to rally around the Institute under the assumption that "if McCarthy and McCarran are against it, it must have been rendering an important national and international service."[48]

In one sense, Carter was right: regardless of its controversial reputation, the IPR was still recognized as important by prominent Asian specialists. Even in the wake of the McCarran report, State Department officials dealing with East Asia and the Pacific

---

[46] American IPR report, Pacific Council meeting, London, Jan. 17-18, 1952, in Box 472, "Pacific Council Minutes and Documents—London 1952," Pacific Relations, COL. Also see William L. Holland to Douglas MacLennan, Dec. 27, 1951, in Box 332, "Canadian Council," *Ibid.* Luce had served as a member of the American IPR Board of Trustees from 1933 until 1946, when he resigned over Alfred Kohlberg's allegations of pro-Communist bias. Luce, however, remained friendly with Carter and was more open-minded regarding the IPR than his reputation as a staunch anti-Communist might suggest. See Patricia Neils, "Henry Luce's Investigation of the Alleged Communist Conspiracy in the IPR," in Paul F. Hooper, ed., *Rediscovering the IPR: Proceedings of the First International Research Conference on the Institute of Pacific Relations* (University of Hawaii, 1993), pp. 67-79.

[47] During the McCarran hearings, a State Department official, Eugene H. Dooman, alleged that Laurence Salisbury, the editor of AIPR's *Far Eastern Survey*, was among the ringleaders of the successful effort to oust Hornbeck from the Office of Far Eastern Affairs when Secretary of State Edward Stettinius carried out a reorganization of the State Department in 1944. Hornbeck was reassigned as ambassador to the Netherlands (1944-47). U.S. Senate, *McCarran Hearings,* pp. 753-754.

[48] Edward Carter to Charles Loomis, Oct. 12, 1951, in Box 8, Folder 17, Carter papers, UVM.

refused to give up subscriptions to *Pacific Affairs* and other IPR-published materials. One noted that "it was simply impossible to avoid the use of their publications without serious damage to the program."[49] The same applied to State Department participation in IPR conferences. Despite the distractions of the Senate hearings, the American IPR had proceeded with plans for two conferences on Japan—one in Princeton, New Jersey, in the fall of 1952 and one in Hawaii in January 1953, the latter co-sponsored with the Japanese Institute of Pacific Relations. Here, too, State Department officers recommended that they be allowed to attend, even if they might suffer adverse publicity. "For our part, we believe that there are solid advantages to be gained by participation," one official wrote. "The Department cannot afford to cut itself off from discussions of the complex relations of the United States and Japan with prominent members of the public who are especially interested in such problems."[50] The willingness of American officials to maintain relations with the IPR, however quietly, signaled the ongoing significance of the Institute's work.

In another sense, Carter's sunny outlook seemed practically delusional when considering the dire financial conditions the American IPR faced by late 1952. Membership in the American council, which had once numbered in the low thousands, had dwindled to a several hundred. The Rockefeller Foundation, whose extraordinary grant in 1950 largely sustained the IPR through the hearings themselves, now privately indicated to IPR leaders that the chances for a renewal of general funds were "practically nil," in the words of Dean Rusk, the recently appointed Foundation president.[51] The

[49] Dan Lacy to Mr. Sims, Oct. 3, 1952, in RG 59, 800.46/10-352, Central Decimal File, NARA.
[50] Mr. Young to Mr. Johnson, "Departmental Participation in IPR Conferences," Oct. 20, 1952, in RG 59, 800.46/10-2052, Central Decimal File, NARA.
[51] William L. Holland to Melvin Conant, Aug. 4, 1952, in Box 42, Folder 1, Institute of Pacific Relations fonds, University of British Columbia archives (UBC), Vancouver. It would be incorrect to characterize the Rockefeller Foundation's decision as simply reactive to the conclusions of the McCarran report; instead, it should be viewed as an anticipated end of a relationship characterized by "long-term mutual dependency," and which the Foundation had indicated its intention to terminate as early as 1945. For a

Carnegie Corporation, which had indicated to the IPR as early as 1946 that its long-term grants would taper off, now made clear their intention to hold to that promise.[52] With the heightened controversy around the Institute, and with Congressional inquiries into the activities of tax-exempt foundations, the decision to back away from funding private international organizations was understandable. But the foundations' retreat was nevertheless a bitter pill for the IPR to swallow. Writing the Carnegie Corporation in late 1952, William Holland wrote that future historians "may find it ironical" that the foundations were so willing to support the IPR when under the leadership of controversialists like Carter, Field and Lattimore, but then ceased support while under the guidance of less political figures like himself and Clayton Lane.[53]

In the months following the McCarran hearings, American IPR leaders recognized that they must reevaluate their entire program from the ground up. With university area programs producing more original research on Asia than ever before, the American IPR needed to redefine its mission if it hoped to attract a new base of support. Recognizing that the American council simply could not simply go back to business as usual, Holland now began to circulate ideas for a Planning and Review Committee to assess the American IPR and offer suggestions for the future.[54] Proposals were

---

more detailed evaluation of this relationship, see Lawrence T. Woods, "Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Institute of Pacific Relations: A Reappraisal of Long-term Mutual Dependency," *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* Vol. 10, No. 2 (1999): 151-166.

[52] In a statement to congressional investigators, the Carnegie Corporation acknowledged that there were early rumblings of charges by Kohlberg in 1946, a fact that was "disquieting" to some in the deliberations to offer a final five-year grant. Nevertheless, "in view of the long history of relations with the Institute and the close connections of previous years, as well as the fact that many people still believed strongly in its value, it would have taken very substantial evidence to have convinced the officers and trustees of the Corporation that it would be justified in departing from its established policy in providing a terminal grant." J.P.G., "Memorandum for Counsel: Record of the Carnegie Corporation and the Institute of Pacific Relations," Aug. 12, 1952, in Box 182, "Institute of Pacific Relations—Congressional investigations, 51-52," Carnegie Corporation grant files, COL.

[53] W.L. Holland to Charles Dollard (Carnegie Corporation of New York), Dec. 29, 1952, in Box 23, Folder 11, IPR fonds, UBC.

[54] Holland had been serving as both secretary-general of the international IPR as well as temporary executive secretary of the American IPR since Clayton Lane's resignation in 1950.

entertained to scrap the existing American council and replace it with some sort of "Coordinating Council on Asian Affairs" that could work as a liaison between scholars in university programs and contacts in business, journalism and the major foundations.[55] Holland convinced Harold H. Fisher, the distinguished chairman of the Hoover Institution and Library in Stanford, California, to become executive director of the American IPR. Holland made clear that he was not wedded to the American IPR for its own sake, but rather for its role in the international IPR structure. In one moment of frustration, Holland made his priorities clear to Fisher:

> As you undoubtedly realize, my main concern in all this is not to preserve the name of the American IPR (which I often wish could be wiped out of existence!) but to add as little as possible to the problems of carrying on the international IPR in the U.S., and if possible to ensure that any new American organization will not only be strong and representative but also prepared to participate actively in the international body.[56]

The name of the American IPR might have been irreparably tarnished in the United States, but the international IPR was carrying on important work in bringing Asian intellectuals into contact with Western scholars and businessmen—work that Holland desperately wanted to see continue. How this work would be affected by the McCarran hearings was still an open question.

During the McCarthy era, the American IPR had been sorely tested as an organization, and its future remained uncertain at the close of 1952. Its members and financial supporters had wilted in the wake of negative publicity surrounding the McCarran hearings. The consequences for free debate in the United States would linger for years, as scholars focusing on Asia became reluctant to engage in contemporary

---

[55] Miriam Farley, "Notes on a possible Council for the Study of Asia," Feb. 29, 1952, in Box 25, Folder 3, IPR fonds, UBC. Also see W.L. Holland, "Memorandum on a More Coordinated Approach to the Study of Asian Problems," n.d., in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4201, RAC.

[56] Underlined in original. W.L. Holland to H.H. Fisher, Nov. 23, 1953, in Box 25, Folder 14, IPR fonds, UBC.

political questions, and instead retreated into less controversial subjects. But beyond the impact upon American experts were the consequences for the international functions of the IPR. Holland and the other leaders of the IPR had some immediate concerns about how to keep the international Institute functioning as a common enterprise that linked Asian and Western intellectuals. Many questions remained: Were Asian minds still undecided, or had they been lost during the recent anti-communist hysteria in the United States? Would Asian intellectuals still be willing to sign up to a group whose top American officials were more convinced than ever that "objectivity" in research necessitated an avowal of anti-communism?[57] And would these Asian institutes still find value in reaching across the Pacific to the West, given the ongoing effort by former colonial peoples in Asia and Africa to create a very different kind of solidarity? In the coming years, Holland and fellow IPR leaders would struggle mightily to create an international space to encourage Asian intellectuals' friendly association with the West, but it was a struggle now made infinitely more difficult because of the machinations of Senators McCarthy and McCarran.

[57] Arthur H. Dean, a prominent Wall Street lawyer who served as chairman of the IPR's Pacific Council during the McCarran hearings, sent out the following advice to leading members of the various national councils in the fall of 1952: "We must be extremely careful that all scholars preparing monographs for the IPR are completely objective in their approach and are not members of or affiliated with the Communist Party, directly or indirectly … I do not believe the IPR should indulge in 'red baiting' but I do believe that it is absolutely imperative that all of the publications of the IPR must be able to stand up to a searching examination." Arthur H. Dean to Members of the Pacific Council, Sept. 29, 1952, in Box 24, Folder 15, IPR fonds, UBC.

Chapter Six

"A Body We Cannot Afford to Lose": The IPR and the Bandung Spirit, 1953-55

On the eve of the first Afro-Asian Conference, held in Bandung, Indonesia in April 1955, U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles confided his concern about a "Pan-Asian movement" to the British Foreign Office, saying that there was "serious danger of a line up of the Asian Powers against the West based on anti-colonial and racial grounds."[1] Dulles' fears reflected many Western officials' views at the time. His perception is significant in the degree to which he equated Asian solidarity with the threat of harm to the West. The conference at Bandung struck Dulles and other Western officials as the culmination of a worrisome trend among the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. This conference, which drew government officials from 29 countries in Asia and Africa to discuss common problems, served as a global announcement that Asian and African nations were prepared to make their own mark as international actors. Ever since, the Bandung Conference, and the subject of Asian regionalism more broadly, has been cast into the polarizing political arena of the Cold War. Western officials viewed Afro-Asian partnership as a blow against U.S. Cold War policies; supporters of this regional grouping saw it as a necessary antidote to Western imperialism and single-minded anti-communism.[2]

---

[1] Sir R. Makins, April 7, 1955, Washington to Foreign Office, in DO 35/6098, The National Archives (TNA), Kew, United Kingdom.

[2] For many years the most prominent carrier of the Bandung flame has been the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, a group whose members are committed to the ideology of shared grievance against Western imperialism in all its forms. Thirty years after Bandung, the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization pointedly called the 1955 gathering "the beginning of an era of collective resistance to imperialism." Chitta Biswas, *The Relevance of Bandung: Thirtieth Anniversary of the Bandung Conference* (Cairo: Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, 1985). The AAPSO had strong ties with Communist groups, and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev extended greetings to the International Bandung and Afro-

But even as officials like Dulles viewed Asian regionalism solely through the context of the Cold War, many others had a far more nuanced outlook toward this movement. This chapter aims to grapple anew with the advent of Asian regionalism in the context of Bandung. This requires a perspective beyond the contemporary diplomatic obsession over the Cold War and into the conversations of the time, discussions that took place especially among Pacific internationalists. At this level of private ideas and institutions, one gains a far different picture of the context surrounding the Bandung moment. Rather than displaying a growing sense of Asian exclusivity, many of the Asian intellectuals who organized and supported the Bandung conference also worked to emphasize West-East ties. One of the primary efforts in this regard was a demonstration of support for the Institute of Pacific Relations, by now at risk of failing in the wake of the McCarran hearings in the United States. Time and again, prominent Asian thinkers came to the aid of this American-based group, and signaled their eagerness to support one of the few organizations that fostered private communication across the Pacific. "This is a body we cannot afford to lose," an Indonesian delegate declared upon their acceptance as an IPR national council in 1953.[3] This chapter argues that Asian support for the IPR during this period should serve to revise our notion of the underlying spirit that animated Bandung,[4] and expand our understanding of the possibilities of international affiliation during the Cold War.

Asian Solidarity Meeting in Cairo in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the original Afro-Asian conference. See Shashi Bhushan, ed., *Twenty Years of Bandung and Problems of Peace and Security in Asia: A Collection of Articles* (Bombay: Allied Publishers Private Ltd., 1975).

[3] Pacific Council Minutes No. 4, Feb. 7, 1953, in Box 472, "Pacific Council Minutes and Documents—New York, 1953," Pacific Relations, Columbia University archives (COL), New York.

[4] Upon the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Asian-African conference at Bandung in 2005, a new organization calling itself "Bandung Spirit" was founded as a call for "peaceful coexistence, for independence from the hegemony of any superpower and for building solidarities towards the weak and those being weakened by the world order of the day." See http://www.bandungspirit.org.

American policymakers like Dulles displayed a "with us or against us" attitude regarding Asian regional organization in the 1950s. The American-backed defensive treaty in 1954 that created the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) attempted to replicate the kind of defense alliance that had linked Western Europe and North America since 1949. But many Asian thinkers had a more subtle view of international ties, especially among private groups. Leaders of Asian institutes saw the development of Asian regionalism and ongoing intellectual connections with North America and Europe as parallel but not necessarily competing trends, a fact seldom mentioned by Bandung scholarship.[5] Asian intellectuals had many occasions before the Bandung conference in which they could have downplayed or dismissed the IPR; it had been weakened by the McCarthy and McCarran attacks in the United States, and its financial resources were dwindling. British members were divided over the continued efficacy of the international organization, and some even tried to terminate it entirely. Yet Asian delegates came to the aid of the IPR and defended its larger mission of East-West partnership. They made it clear that an absent IPR would result in their turning away from Western institutional connections—an outcome they anticipated but did not welcome.

Far from the anti-Western prejudices ascribed by Western policymakers, many Asian intellectuals actively worked to overcome the divisions brought about through the legacy of colonialism. Joining an organization like the Institute of Pacific Relations expressed a willingness to engage with Western scholarship and share wisdom and perspective on contemporary political and economic challenges. One noteworthy example of this ideal was the case of Indonesia. In 1949, upon Indonesian independence,

[5] Devendra Kaushik, "From Asian Consciousness to Asian Collective Security in Bandung Spirit: Asian Peace Strategy in Historical Perspective," in Shashi Bhushan, ed., *Twenty Years of Bandung*, pp. 110-123; Aravinda Ramachandra Deo, "Bandung and the Non-Alignment Movement," in Laszlo Lang, ed., *Bandung—Thirty Years After* (Budapest: Hungarian Peace Council, 1985), pp. 15-23.

the cumbersomely named “Netherlands-Netherlands East Indies” council based in Amsterdam had formally dissolved, but within a few short years Indonesians and Dutch alike had formed new institutes of international affairs in their respective countries and both sought renewed affiliation with the IPR. The Indonesian Institute of World Affairs, led by Prof. R. Supomo of the University of Indonesia, applied to be an IPR national council in the fall of 1952.[6] Within a matter of weeks, IPR Secretary-General William Holland received similar notice of the creation of the Netherlands Institute of International Affairs. After working through various delicate matters to prevent potential conflict between the two national groups, Holland was prepared to put their applications before the Institute and admit them both as full members.[7]

However eager Asians and Westerners may have been to keep private ties across the Pacific, the exact nature of that exchange was open for debate. This chapter follows this discussion across the critical months and years of the mid-1950s, when it was no longer certain that the Institute of Pacific Relations would remain a viable international organization. The aftermath of the McCarran subcommittee hearings in the U.S. Senate had marred the group’s reputation and dried up the bulk of its American financial support. Some in Britain, meanwhile, touted the Commonwealth of Nations as the most fortuitous channel for private discussion between Asia and the West, and viewed the IPR

---

[6] W.L. Holland to R. Supomo, Aug. 20, 1952; R. Supomo, “Memorandum the Indonesian Council of International Affairs,” n.d.; Holland to Supomo, Nov. 28, 1952, all in Box 43, Folder 2, Institute of Pacific Relations fonds, University of British Columbia (UBC), Vancouver.

[7] The Dutch and Indonesian representatives at the IPR’s Pacific Council meeting in February 1953 were very aware of the mutual concessions needed in order for both councils to coexist within the IPR. According to the Pacific Council’s minutes, the Indonesian Institute’s representative, Surjotjondro, reported that his group “would welcome the membership in the IPR of a non-political Netherlands organization concerned with cultural, social and economic problems rather than with political matters.” The Netherlands group’s observer, Dr. Crena de Iongh, responded by saying that he could assure the Pacific Council that the Netherlands Institute of International Affairs “was a scientific and scholarly organization and that its work would raise no problems for the Indonesian Institute.” *Pacific Council Minutes No. 1*, Feb. 6, 1953, in Box 472, “Pacific Council Minutes and Documents – New York 1953,” Pacific Relations, COL.

as a hindrance to a potential London-based scholarly organization that could reinvigorate British informal influence in Asia. Squabbles between British and American members made it difficult to generalize about a single "Western" position in the IPR. The Institute's twelfth conference, held in Kyoto in 1954, revealed a growing sense of "Asian" sentiment among many of its members, but at the same time a strong desire to support intellectual projects with the West. Delegates signaled a commitment to the kind of international community represented by the IPR, one that was beholden neither to Cold War politics nor third-world solidarity. Pacific internationalism may have been constrained during these years, yet it was buoyed by strong Asian support.

MACADAM'S SURPRISE

Ivison S. Macadam, the longtime director general of Chatham House, watched with growing concern as the McCarran Committee's investigation into the activities of the Institute of Pacific Relations wore on through 1951 and into 1952. The American IPR was the main target of the senatorial inquisitors, but Macadam worried that the reputation of the international IPR—and its constituent national councils, including Chatham House—would suffer as well. For many years after his elevation to the head of Chatham House in 1929 and the age of 35, Macadam not only had served as the chief British representative to the IPR, but also one of the group's chief internal critics. He particularly objected to the leadership of Edward Carter as being overtly anti-colonial in nature, and had successfully marshaled other European national councils to force Carter's ouster as IPR's secretary-general in 1946.[8] The succeeding years, however, had apparently brightened his view of the Institute. By the time of the McCarran hearings, Macadam expressed confidence in the IPR's objectivity. Roger Evans, the Rockefeller

[8] See Chapter Three for a full recounting of this episode.

Foundation's assistant director for social sciences, pointedly asked Macadam in the fall of 1951 whether he believed the IPR was now "clean" of leftism. Macadam replied: "Absolutely, and I say that with such authority as my 22 years service as UK National Secretary may give."[9] He pledged to do whatever he could to help the Institute during its time of trouble.

But even as Macadam publicly pledged confidence in the IPR, he privately began to develop ideas about how to hasten its dissolution. For someone who had often complained about Carter's devious leadership, Macadam was an expert in his own kind of subterfuge. In the wake of the McCarran hearings, Macadam increasingly began to see the weakness of the American IPR as an opening for Asian specialists in Britain to create a new British-led organization along the lines of the Commonwealth Relations Conference. Macadam's efforts highlighted a growing feeling within Chatham House that they were the only people who could effectively run such an organization along "scientific" and "objective" lines.[10] They had been forced to play second-fiddle to the Americans for decades in the IPR, but British members now realized that the McCarran charges had left an opening in the international leadership of Asian studies. British diplomatic recognition of the Communist Chinese government, moreover, made British foreign policy in Asia appear more tolerant than the American insistence on regarding the nationalist forces in Taiwan as the true Chinese government. The British Empire in Asia may have dissolved, but Macadam and his fellow Chatham House colleagues were determined to guard and even enhance their intellectual influence among Asian specialists.

---

[9] "RFE Interview: Ivison S. Macadam," Oct. 9, 1951, Box 358, Folder 4252, in Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.
[10] See A.S.B. Olver to I.S. Macadam, Jan. 8, 1953, in CHA 6/2/37, Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), London.

The Commonwealth of Nations appeared to be the ideal avenue whereby Chatham House could assert its ongoing relevance in Asia. For many years the British Commonwealth had been associated with the "Old Dominions"—Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. But with the inclusion of India, Pakistan and Ceylon in the wake of their independence, the post-war Commonwealth had dropped its "British" prefix and was now a multi-racial club. Beginning in 1933, Chatham House had organized a series of British Commonwealth Relations Conferences (BCRC), which periodically assembled the member nations' respective institutes of international affairs. While the personnel in these gatherings often resembled IPR conferences, their tone stressed the commonalities of heritage and outlook rather than sharp disagreements. The 1949 Commonwealth conference, held in Ontario, Canada, witnessed real enthusiasm among the Asian participants for closer ties within the Commonwealth. Having entered voluntarily into the Commonwealth, the argument went, these countries now wanted to see just how much it could mean to them.[11] British governmental officials were thrilled with the prospect of deepening private relations with Asia, and did all they could to foster them. When Indian delegates at the 1950 IPR conference in Lucknow criticized American foreign policy, British members were quick to stress the relative comity of Indian-British relations. J. Mitcheson of the British Consulate office in San Francisco explained the strategy in a memorandum to the British Embassy in Washington:

> We ourselves of course are at pains to stress, whenever we see an opportunity like this that the best approach to the problem of winning the Asians to the side of the West lies in the British Commonwealth, which, containing as it does such a large proportion of Asians, is the natural bridge between the East and the West.[12]

Such a statement could be seen as a challenge to American-led private efforts to do just this, especially the Institute of Pacific Relations. British officials touting the

[11] I. Norman Smith, Sept. 21, 1949, *Ottowa Journal*, in CHA 7/4/4, RIIA.
[12] J. Mitcheson to H.A. Graves, Nov. 15, 1950, in FO 371/84700, TNA.

Commonwealth as the "natural bridge" between Asia and the West, however, were less than clear about what role the American-centered IPR might play in this vision of international relations. Would the IPR help solidify relations between these Commonwealth nations, or was the Institute an impediment to this vision? And with the IPR now politically marginalized in the United States, how should the British respond? Such questions for the moment were left unanswered as the IPR's viability remained in flux.

Macadam's initial offer to help the Institute of Pacific Relations consisted of a proposal in the summer of 1952 to create a new temporary international headquarters in London.[13] For years, top IPR leaders had discussed the desirability of moving the international secretariat out of New York City, but the preferred move was into Asia. The McCarran hearings and the resultant difficulties made the idea of a "caretaker regime" even more pressing for both the American IPR as well as the international office. Melvin Conant, an old IPR colleague in Hawaii, expressed willingness to operate the American IPR from the U.S. island territory, as needed; Macadam's similar offer on behalf of the international IPR was taken in the same generous spirit. Funds did not exist to establish a new Asian headquarters, after all, and with the weakening of the American council, Chatham House was now the strongest IPR national unit. Ultimately, however, IPR Secretary-General William Holland decided against making any drastic moves, preferring instead to bring up these proposals up for a fuller discussion at a later date.

Matters came to a head at the IPR's Pacific Council meeting in early February 1953 in New York City, where representatives from national councils gathered to discuss the future program of the organization. It was here, in the presence of the top IPR leaders, that Macadam dispensed with his offer to sustain the Institute and instead

[13] W.L. Holland to Melvin Conant, Aug. 4, 1952, Box 42, Folder 1, IPR fonds, UBC.

unloaded a bombshell: he now proposed that the international IPR be dissolved immediately.[14] Macadam said that the McCarran hearings had irreparably harmed the reputation of the Institute, and that the American public would no longer support it. Conversations with foundation officials, moreover, had convinced Macadam that future financial support was a dim prospect. Furthermore, he suggested that there was little point in trying to rehabilitate the IPR's name, when even former friends of the Institute had failed to stand up on its behalf; its past record made it "not a good wicket to take a stand on."[15] He concluded that it was better to leave the playing field entirely and hope that an unspecified new organization, under new leadership, might win over support. Macadam knew that the next gathering of many of the national institutes of international relations would be the Commonwealth Relations Conference, scheduled for the spring of 1954. Left unsaid was that the Commonwealth gatherings certainly would gain greater international attention and clout with the IPR out of the way.

Fellow Institute leaders at the New York meeting were stunned. The IPR had had a difficult couple of years, certainly, but none had suggested that the international body be discontinued. Only one other member, a Canadian, was willing to support the plan. Not even Macadam's fellow Europeans, who had been critical of the IPR in the past, were prepared to take such a pessimistic view of the situation. The Netherlands observer, Crena de Iongh, said that without any concrete alternative to the IPR, he thought "it was very bad to quit." The longtime French representative, Roger Levy, demurred as well, and said leaders should focus instead on resuscitating the IPR's international reputation. Perhaps someone should nominate the Institute for the Nobel Peace Prize, Levy offered. William Holland, representing the international secretariat, held in check both his

---

[14] Pacific Council Minutes No. 2, Feb. 6, 1953, in Box 472, "Pacific Council Minutes and Documents—New York, 1953," Pacific Relations, COL.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

surprise and anger at Macadam's suggestion, saying simply that the organization had sufficient funds for the immediate future, and that it must be given a chance to reverse its recent fortune: "The IPR has had its Dunkirk, though it has not yet reached its El Alamein." Even Laurence Heyworth, Macadam's fellow British representative at the meeting and the Institute's international finance chairman, failed to back his compatriot. Heyworth, like the others, recommended rehabilitation over a death sentence.[16]

ASIAN SUPPORT

If most European and American leaders were generally skeptical of Macadam's proposal to dissolve the Institute of Pacific Relations, Asian members were openly critical of the idea. To lose the IPR was to lose a major benefactor for research and publication. Institutes of international affairs in Asia often had no other formal affiliation with other foreign groups. Attaching themselves to the IPR gave them considerable prestige in the eyes of the international scholarly community, and often bolstered their position among rival institutes at home. Most critically, the IPR had proven itself to be an independent and open-minded group of experts in the field of Asian studies, with personal connections in Asia dating back to the 1920s. The recent attacks on the Institute in the United States merely reinforced the Institute's reputation as a fair and honest body. Whereas confidence in the West in general was lagging, the IPR still maintained its good standing among the Asian councils. If the IPR were to disappear, however, there was no guarantee that Asians would continue to affiliate with other Western groups, which in the postwar years were increasingly focused on purely anti-communist objectives.

Asian members at the New York meeting spoke up in defense of the organization. The Japan council already had extended invitations to IPR members for the next IPR

---

[16]*Ibid.,* pp. 3-7.

conference, scheduled for the fall of 1953 in Kyoto; Japanese representatives complained that canceling might have dire effects upon their national institute's future. The Indian representative P.S. Narasimhan meanwhile asserted that "a majority of Asians attach great value to the IPR," and thus to scrap the name thus would be "most unfair" to those who were committed to the group.[17] Narasimhan predicted that the upcoming Kyoto conference would have a positive effect on the IPR as a whole, and perhaps could serve as the basis of a revival. The two Indonesians at the meeting, Sujono Surjotjondro and Agus Salim, stated that their countrymen had applied to join the IPR "in the sound conviction that this is a body we cannot afford to lose," and that having just joined, they were certainly not prepared to abandon the Institute at this juncture.[18] As a result of these testimonials, the Pacific Council rejected Macadam's idea, agreeing merely to monitor the IPR's health and revisit the issue as needed.

News of the meeting quickly spread, and provoked other statements of Asian support for the group. One of the most significant statements came from D.R. Gadgil, director of India's Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics and one of Asia's top economists and public servants.[19] Gadgil served as the chairman of the IPR's international program committee, and he now leapt to the defense of the IPR as a critical body in East-West relations. In a letter filled with both passion and clarity, Gadgil wrote Holland about the faults in Macadam's argument, and the implications of his proposal for trans-Pacific contact more broadly. Gadgil first took issue with the notion that the politically motivated McCarran attacks had damaged the IPR's international reputation:

> It should be realized that this fact by itself not only does not discredit the IPR in Indian or Asiatic eyes, but rather increases the sympathy felt for that organization

---

[17] Pacific Council Minutes No. 3, Feb. 7, 1953, in *Ibid.,* p. 7.
[18] Pacific Council Minutes No. 4, Feb. 7, 1953, in *Ibid.,* p. 2.
[19] The accolade was bestowed by George B. Baldwin in his review of Economic Policy and Development: A Collection of Writings by D.R. Gadgil, *Far Eastern Survey,* Vol. 25, No. 3 (March 1956): 47-48.

> (and may I add admiration for the spirited stand made by its officers). The alleged left sympathies of the IPR do not shock us; in fact, one might almost venture on the broad generalization that anything which is not at least a little left of centre in US will be out of focus for the bulk of intelligent people in India and most other Asiatic countries.

If American corporate and philanthropic interests were no longer willing to support the Institute's work for political reasons, Gadgil continued, there was no guarantee that Asians would acquiesce in a replacement organization. "It is very premature for [Macadam] to think that all National Councils are merely waiting to be gathered into a new net," he wrote. Why would Asian councils be willing to join a new group whose origins were a capitulation to political pressure, and whose very nature would thus be compromised? Gadgil concluded by issuing a stark warning to his fellow IPR members about the consequences of dissolution for East-West partnerships:

> If the actions of [Macadam] are to govern decisions relating to the US Organization and to govern the inclinations of the British and Canadians, I can see neither virtue nor profit in associating in a new International Organization with them. It would then, in my opinion, be better for the Asians to think in terms of an Asian Organization, which may later be adhered to, if possible, by African Councils creating in this way an international group with a comparatively homogenous approach to world affairs.

Here, in brief, was the clearest possible statement regarding the consequences of a weakened trans-Pacific community. Gadgil clearly anticipated that the impact of an absent IPR would result not in a reconfigured Western-oriented group, but rather in the kind of Afro-Asian affiliation that would form the basis of the Bandung conference two years later, as well as the Cairo conference of late 1957. Holland immediately recognized the value of Gadgil's prophetic note, and forwarded copies of his letter to top Institute leaders around the world.[20]

---

[20] D.R. Gadgil to W.L. Holland, March 3, 1953; Holland to Gadgil, March 23, 1953, both in Box 26, Folder 2, IPR fonds, UBC.

Other national council representatives were more directly suspicious of Macadam's motivations for suggesting the dissolution of the Institute. The French were among the first to question whether Macadam was being entirely objective when the British representative panned the IPR's utility. Three days after the conclusion of the Pacific Council meetings in New York, Roger Levy paid a visit to the Rockefeller Foundation, where he reported on Macadam's failed effort to break up the IPR. According to an account of the interview, Levy said that upon reflection, he believed Macadam's "real concern was that a continuance of an American-dominated IPR would be prejudicial to British interests in the Orient—hence his desire to let the IPR go, and continue the functions under a new international organization with a new name, heading up to London."[21] Levy's suspicions quickly found their way to top French governmental officials, who were actively following the drama in New York City. On February 9, 1953, Henri Bonnet, the French ambassador to the United States, wrote to Foreign Minister Georges Bidault that it was highly unlikely that the American people would stand for the transfer of the center of gravity of Asian studies from New York to London. British political views toward Asia were—to say the very least—*suspectes* in American eyes, Bonnet concluded.[22]

Macadam may have correctly read the mood of British diplomatic officials, and he no doubt saw an opportunity to strike a blow for the Commonwealth at the expense of the American-dominated IPR,[23] but his proposal irked even many of his colleagues at

---

[21] Roger F. Evans interview with Roger Levy, Feb. 10, 1953, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 359, Folder 4259, RAC.

[22] Henri Bonnet to Georges Bidault, Feb. 9, 1953, in Vol. 9, Direction Asie-Océanie (1944-1955), Ministre des Affaires Etrangères (MAE), Paris.

[23] The French were not the only ones to notice the power-play. Shiroshi Nasu, a Japanese delegate at the Pacific Council meeting, met with the State Department's acting director of northern Asia, Robert J.G. McClurkin, and told him that he felt "the British IPR favored a Commonwealth IPR conference in Pakistan next spring and that they were perhaps seeking to undermine the Kyoto conference as it would detract from the importance of the proposed Commonwealth Conference." Memorandum of conversation, Feb. 16,

Chatham House who were not consulted in advance. Macadam's reputation at the Royal Institute of International Affairs in the early 1950s, in fact, was somewhat analogous to Edward Carter's position within the IPR at the end of World War II: both were strong personalities who had directed their respective organizations for years, and were used to leading from the front. But Macadam increasingly found himself isolated and resented by others in the British Institute.[24] Victor Purcell, the Malayan specialist who had clashed with Macadam over previous research projects, privately had warned William Holland in 1952 that the long-serving Chatham House director was duplicitous, pretending to help the IPR while at the same time working against it: "It is quite clear that he intends to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds as long as he can, and then, if necessary, hunt with the hounds *tout simple*."[25] In the wake of the Pacific Council meeting, Holland decided he should bypass Macadam and directly inform several Chatham House members serving on its Pacific Relations Committee—including Arthur Creech Jones, Sir Andrew McFadyean, Sir John Pratt, as well as Purcell—regarding Holland's impressions of the meeting. When they heard, most were appalled. Purcell replied that it was "monstrous" that Macadam failed to consult them before floating his dissolution proposal.[26] Within weeks, in a dramatic rebuke to their own director-general, the Chatham House Pacific Relations Committee announced that Macadam did not speak for the British group on IPR matters, and would never again represent them at IPR meetings.[27]

1953, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 800.46/2-1653, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.

[24] Peter Calvocoressci, a staff member of Chatham House from 1950-55, provided in his memoirs an unflattering portrait of Macadam, referring to him simply as "the Director-General." Calvocoressi, *Threading My Way* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1994), p. 152.

[25] "Tout simple"—in other words, on his own. Victor Purcell to W.L. Holland, (Personal), July 28, 1952, in Box 30, Folder 4, IPR fonds, UBC.

[26] Purcell to Holland, Feb. 23, 1953, in *Ibid.*

[27] Pacific Relations Committee Minutes, March 31, 1953, in CHA 6/1/13, RIIA.

This episode may have remained yet another internal Chatham House-IPR dustup, but instead it erupted into the British press. William Holland, who in mid-February 1953 still did not know if Macadam might be able to bully his views on the IPR through Chatham House, made a bold decision to leak the confidential minutes of the Pacific Council meeting to Guy Wint, a longtime Institute friend and editorial writer for the *Manchester Guardian.*[28] It was an act of desperation, one of the very few times Holland had acted deceptively as secretary-general. The left-leaning *Guardian* was happy to receive such red meat against the notoriously stodgy and conservative denizens of Chatham House. On March 19, the *Guardian* published an editorial that praised the IPR's work and condemned the "British" proposal (it did not mention Macadam by name) to wind up the international Institute as "deplorable," saying the recommendation amounted to a surrender to its McCarthyist critics. "It is hard to believe that Chatham House would lower its standards and take part in any manoeuver that would be repugnant to the liberal spirit. It ought rather to stand as the defender of academic liberties," the editorial intoned.[29] The *Guardian* editorial, combined with Chatham House's own rebuke of Macadam, served notice that the IPR's reputation would be publicly defended in Britain, at least for the time being.[30]

---

[28] Holland wrote Wint: "Please treat [the Pacific Council memorandum] with discretion. I am sure you will be as surprised as many others at the meeting were at the strange position taken by Macadam." Wint replied: "Thank you very much for your letter and the memorandum. I think we shall have an article in the *Guardian* about the future of the IPR. But we won't give away the source of our information." Holland to Wint, Feb. 19, 1953; and Wint to Holland, Feb. 24, 1953, both in Box 31, Folder 12, IPR fonds, UBC.

[29] *Manchester Guardian Weekly* editorial, March 19, 1953.

[30] Holland's gambit of using the press on behalf of the IPR succeeded almost too well. The *Guardian*'s flaying of Chatham House brought considerable embarrassment to the British council, and the resulting back-and-forth between the newspaper and Institute threatened to expose Holland's role in the initial leak. Sir Andrew McFadyean, a former businessman in Asia and a Liberal Party stalwart, had friendly ties to Holland and the IPR and now was tapped as chair of the Pacific Relations Committee. McFadyean was not supportive of Macadam's actions, but he nevertheless felt obliged to defend Chatham House from the paper's charges. McFadyean decided to write a letter to the *Guardian* in which he disputed the newspaper's account of the IPR meeting, asserting that the paper had little business commenting on a private meeting whose confidential discussions it could not possibly know. The *Guardian*, in response, published a second editorial, on Nov. 28, 1953, in which it defended its accuracy and later quoted directly

Macadam's loss of confidence in the IPR, and the subsequent *Guardian* expose, had the effect of drawing into sharp relief the question of British support of the Institute. If Chatham House members truly felt that they could lead a Commonwealth-inspired group that could bring together East and West, why should they continue support an ailing international institute whose American members had caused them headaches for so many years? Yet for the moment, whatever their misgivings, Chatham House members were not prepared to back their director in his bid for the IPR's dissolution. Part of this was due to internal politics at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and Macadam's faltering leadership. Part of this, too, was due to the need to keep American support for Commonwealth action. The encouragement of Commonwealth ties, in other words, could not be seen to come at the expense of the Anglo-American partnership. But finally, one must not overlook the importance of the show of support by Asian members for the IPR. Whether Indian or Pakistani, Japanese or Indonesian, they made it known that formal affiliation with the IPR was a priority that must not be abandoned.

If anything, the Macadam controversy made the British as well as the Americans more aware of the value of private Asian-West contact facilitated by the IPR; without this connection, Asian elites might very well go their own way and form an all-Asian group. As top Institute leaders prepared for the next international conference in Kyoto, this implied threat hung in the background. The chairman of the Japanese IPR, Keizo

---

from the Pacific Council minutes. "Heaven knows how the *M.G.* came to possess them," a frustrated McFadyean wrote Holland. The secretary general still played cover-up: "I am quite mystified as to how the *Guardian* could have had access to the Minutes and even more at such a breach of normal editorial practice." After several months of controversy, Holland managed to end the awkwardness for Chatham House and keep his own role quiet by writing a series of private letters to Guy Wint and issuing a formal complaint to the *Guardian,* protesting the publication of confidential information, documents that of course he himself had provided. W.L. Holland to Sir Andrew McFadyean, Dec. 31, 1953; also see McFadyean to Holland, Dec. 16, 1953, both in Box 28, Folder 13; Sir Andrew McFadyean to Editor, *Manchester Guardian*, Dec. 2, 1953, Box 43, Folder 19; W.L. Holland to Ivison S. Macadam, Dec. 10, 1953, in Box 43, Folder 19; Holland to Guy Wint, Dec. 11, 1953, in Box 31, Folder 12; Holland to McFadyean, Dec. 31, 1953, in Box 28, Folder 13; Holland to Editor, *Manchester Guardian*, Dec. 31, 1953, Box 28, Folder 13, all in IPR fonds, UBC.

Shibusawa, a former governor of the Bank of Japan, wrote his Western counterparts in 1953 that a conference should take place as soon as possible "if IPR is confident of its original objectives and is really in for action as it should be."[31] Shibusawa's tone was friendly but pointed, and served notice that the Japanese would not have infinite patience with further delays over Macadam's tactics. In the United States, rumors spread that Japan was giving serious thought to holding an interim IPR conference in Asia sometime in 1953 that would exclude Westerners.[32] Hawaii's Melvin Conant wrote to the Japanese, warning that such a conference would "impair the spirit" of future IPR gatherings, whose basis rested upon the East-West connection.[33] In the end, officials agreed to postpone the IPR Kyoto conference one year, to the fall of 1954.[34] Macadam's dustup was thus put uncomfortably behind them.

THE KYOTO CONFERENCE, 1954

More than 100 delegates descended on the former Japanese capitol city of Kyoto in the last week of September 1954 for the Institute of Pacific Relations' twelfth international conference. International events in 1954 had cast a particular note of urgency into the Institute's work. Early in the year, the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu and by late April they were forced to concede independence to Indochina at the Geneva Conference. The United States refused to recognize the Geneva Accords—

---

[31] Keizo Shibusawa to Edgar McInnis, Acting IPR Chairman, Aug. 3, 1953, in Box 28, Folder 15, IPR fonds, UBC.

[32] J. Ballard Atherton, President, IPR of Hawaii, to J. Morden Murphy, Chairman, IPR Pacific Council, June 29, 1953, Box 41, Folder 7, IPR fonds, UBC.

[33] Melvin Conant, Director, IPR of Hawaii, to M. Matsuo, Executive Secretary, Japanese IPR, n.d., Box 42, Folder 2, IPR fonds, UBC.

[34] This was a partial victory for Chatham House, which, along with the Australian and Canadian councils, wished to draw greater attention to the Commonwealth Relations conference, scheduled for March 1954 in Lahore, Pakistan. T.N.M. Buesst, President, Australian Institute of International Affairs, to W.L. Holland, June 1, 1953, in Box 42, Folder 6; and Edgar McInnis, President, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, to Keizo Shibusawa, June 16, 1953, in Box 42, Folder 9, both in IPR fonds, UBC.

drawing a provisional line between the northern and southern zones of Vietnam to facilitate the withdrawal of forces—in order to deny legitimacy to the communist-controlled north. In early September, the United States, France, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan signed the Manila Pact, which created an anti-communist military alliance known as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). The founding of SEATO now made it abundantly clear that the United States government saw Southeast Asia as a critical front in the Cold War. But notable was the failure of many Asian countries to join in this anti-communist alliance: India, Indonesia and Burma preferred to maintain neutrality, while the Geneva Accords prevented Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos from official participation in any such international pact. In sum, unaffiliated Asians were becoming ever more suspicious of American "imperialism" on the continent.

The Institute of Pacific Relations itself, meanwhile, found itself at a watershed moment. The international organization would continue for now; this much was clear. But the central dynamic among its participants had shifted. For years, the IPR had been largely a Western group looking East; its conferences had been dominated by American, British, Canadian and Australian delegates pursuing topics about Asia. But by the early 1950s, Asian members had reached a critical mass; Indians, Pakistanis, Japanese and Indonesians now began to assert their voices within the IPR. Burma, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand and Ceylon still were not formally recognized as national councils, but individuals from these countries attended gatherings as "guest observers." These Asian voices were interested in discussing their own concerns, which did not necessarily accord with the West's perspective. Poverty, land reform, population pressures, and trade were far more important to these Asian delegates than the preoccupation with communism.[35]

[35] Benjamin Kizer to Albert Mayer, Oct. 20, 1954, in Box 27, Folder 16, IPR fonds, UBC.

Kyoto would represent a moment at which western IPR leaders were forced to reckon with Asians on their own terms, and a chance to think anew about the East-West partnership. In Kyoto, the continent would be allowed to speak for itself.

Even before the Kyoto conference began, IPR members sensed that the gathering would have a more assertive Asian perspective. As the American Institute struggled under the cloud of McCarthyism, and as the British dealt with the fallout from Macadam's defeatism, Asian councils took the lead in planning the conference agenda. As chairman of the IPR's Program Committee, India's D.R. Gadgil prepared a draft agenda in early 1953 whose main theme stressed the "Improvement of Living Standards in Asia" and largely avoided politically charged topics. For Gadgil and others, debate over living standards and regional technical development were more productive than political discussions involving communist designs in Asia. Not all members agreed, however. At the March 1954 Commonwealth Relations conference in Lahore, some delegates took time from their usual business to hold an informal IPR Pacific Council meeting. These representatives—especially British, Canadian and Australian members—argued that it "would not be possible to avoid a discussion of political and strategic issues," and urged their inclusion in the Kyoto agenda.[36] Holland agreed with their recommendations, and passed along a new revised agenda, disregarding Gadgil's earlier proposal.[37] When Asian leaders received the new agenda, they were miffed at the changes. The Japanese council's executive director, Nobutane Kiuchi, sent a frank letter

---

[36] Those present at the informal meeting included two representatives each from the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, as well as one representative from New Zealand, India, Pakistan and the United States. See Edgar McInnis, "Summary of an informal meeting of Pacific Council members," March 21, 1954, Box 28, Folder 15, IPR fonds, UBC.

[37] The omission was apparently unintentional, and Holland was apologetic for the misunderstanding. See W.L. Holland to D.R. Gadgil, July 2, 1954; Gadgil to Holland, July 10, 1954; both in Box 26, Folder 2, IPR fonds, UBC. Also see Holland to Edgar McInnis, June 24, 1954, in Box 41, Folder 1, IPR fonds, UBC.

of objection to Holland. The proposed agenda was too "Western" as distinguished from "Asian," Kiuchi wrote on behalf of his council:

> [T]he problems of Asia seem to be presented in a particular context of … Western democracies vs. Communist countries. Consequently, we fear, this agenda might give an undue impression that the conference were to discuss the problems of Asia with the primary objective of searching for what can be and should be done to retain Asia on the side of Western democracies in the cold war.[38]

The Japanese, along with other Asian councils, believed that bringing up the Cold War would only serve to divide the delegates. In the end, the Asian delegates largely won the day: the conference agenda remained primarily focused upon Asian standards of living with a provisional allowance for later discussion of international ramifications—a compromise that avoided putting Asians on the spot regarding their outlook on the Cold War.[39]

Asian delegates again showed their newfound organizational strength over matters of the membership eligibility of the Soviet Union and Communist China. The Chinese IPR had simply dissolved after the 1949 revolution. The Soviet Union council, meanwhile, had last participated in the 1936 conference at Yosemite and was widely considered long-defunct. Keeping these communist countries as even potential Institute participants was a political liability, however, in the wake of the McCarran hearings. Some American IPR members moved to strip the USSR of its eligibility to rejoin the group, citing the impossibility of a non-partisan, non-governmental, politically independent research body from emerging in a communist country.[40] But the Indonesian Institute of World Affairs, backed by Japan and India, vetoed the idea, citing the Soviet Union's acknowledged position as a Pacific power. "The admittance of political

[38] Nobutane Kiuchi to W.L. Holland, July 13, 1954, in Box 43, Folder 7, IPR fonds, UBC.
[39] Pacific Council Minutes No. 1, Sept. 25, 1954, in Box 472, "1954 Conference at Kyoto: Minutes of Pacific Council Meeting," Pacific Relations, COL.
[40] Pacific Council Minutes No. 1, Feb. 6, 1953, in Box 472, "Pacific Council Minutes and Documents—New York 1953," Pacific Relations, COL.

considerations on the matter of eligibility would create a precedent which in future might gravely impair the effectiveness of the work of the IPR," wrote the Indonesian council's secretary-general, Soedjatmoko.[41] In the end, the principle of inclusion overrode anti-communism. Westerners acquiesced to this objection, and thus the USSR, along with Communist China, remained free to participate in the IPR, however unlikely the prospect. It was an important symbolic move, if nothing else. By keeping the door open to China and the USSR, the IPR could not be framed as a purely anti-communist international grouping.

One measure of the conciliatory stance regarding the communist and capitalist divide was the liberal use of the phrase "peaceful co-existence" at the Kyoto conference. This phrase was first associated with the communist states of Eastern Europe, which postulated ways in which to live peacefully alongside their capitalist neighbors. "Peaceful co-existence" also connoted an intentional thawing of the Cold War, and it became a catchphrase advocated by the majority of IPR participants, save for a few American delegates.[42] Some of the most forceful and eloquent defenders of "peaceful co-existence" were in the British delegation, by far the most experienced and balanced group attending the conference. Shaking off the previous year's controversy, Chatham House sent a powerful delegation with a mixture of academic, business and diplomatic backgrounds—but with a more progressive outlook than usual. The head of the British delegation, Kenneth Younger, was a Labor Party leader and a former minister of state at the Foreign Office. Younger was already known for his efforts to move the British government toward closer ties with Communist China, and he quickly established himself

[41] Soedjatmoko to W.L. Holland, April 27, 1953, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 359, Folder 4260, RAC.

[42] "The kind of co-existence the Communists are talking about is phony," Dr. Harold H. Fisher, Stanford University professor and chief American delegate to the Institute of Pacific Relations 12th meeting said. "It is not peaceful co-existence to wage wars of liberation, class wars, psychological wars, civil wars, economic wars and every other kind of war except total war." Quoted in *Nippon Times*, Oct. 5, 1954.

as one of the most dominant personalities of the conference. He was supported by Lord Lindsay,[43] a senior fellow in the international relations department at Australian National University, with deep and acknowledged connections to the Chinese communist regime. Without any other delegates with extensive knowledge of the Chinese government (and of course without the participation of the Chinese themselves), Younger and Lindsay's views took on heightened importance, and gave the British considerable influence at the conference.[44]

One of the reasons why Asian voices emerged so strongly at Kyoto was the division among the Western delegates. Whenever discussion turned to relations between the communist and non-communist worlds, the stature of the British soared and that of the Americans collapsed.[45] British diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China in 1950 contributed to Asian goodwill toward the European power. The United States' refusal to do so, on the other hand, made them appear ideologically obstinate and unwilling to compromise with communist nations. In early October, toward the end of the conference, *The Mainichi*, Japan's best-known English-language daily paper, sponsored a special political roundtable discussion between leaders of the American, British, Indian and Japanese delegations. Kenneth Younger reiterated the need for "peaceful co-existence" but his American counterpart, University of Washington Professor Charles Martin, disagreed, calling it "a magic phrase" that would only give communists time to regroup and revert to "external aggression and revolutionary annihilation."[46] Such talk did not impress the Indian representative H.R. Kunzru, the

---

[43] Lindsay officially participated as part of the Australian delegation.
[44] J.R. Greenwood, Vice-Consul and Information Officer, Kyoto Consulate-General, "12th Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations," in FO 371/110186, TNA.
[45] Although the formal conference agenda was restricted to relatively technical matters involving economic development, IPR delegates carried on lively political debate in the corridors, over dinner, and in the pages of the local press in Japan, which covered the proceedings in considerable detail.
[46] *The Mainichi* (Japan), Oct. 6-7, 1954.

head of the Indian Council of World Affairs, a former minister of parliament and close friend of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. "There are two alternatives before us," Kunzru asserted plainly. "Peaceful co-existence and war."[47] Other Asian delegates largely agreed with Kunzru's assessment of the world situation, and found intriguing India's foreign policy approach of neutralism in the Cold War.

American delegates at Kyoto were deeply aware of the United States' poor reputation in Asia. Charles Martin, for instance, described his country's standing in Asia as "lower than a gopher."[48] But despite widespread criticism of U.S. foreign policy at the conference, the American delegation to the IPR conference by and large found a somewhat sympathetic audience. The precarious American IPR was more of a pitiable rather than formidable presence at the conference; Japanese and Indian delegates were less inclined to embarrass the Americans when they were facing such hardships at home.[49] Secretary-General William Holland had unsuccessfully tried to enlist a number of prominent American businessmen with Asian interests to take part in the Kyoto conference, but none wished to be associated with an Institute still reeling from the McCarran hearings.[50] The eventual 10-member American delegation, as a consequence, was small and admittedly uneven, composed entirely of university professors whose public pronouncements were regarded as "cautious" and "sincere" rather than particularly knowledgeable about technical issues involving Asian living standards.[51] While

---

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] Prof. Charles Martin, quoted in Gregory Henderson, Director, American Cultural Center, Kyoto, *Foreign Service Despatch No. 95*, Oct. 15, 1954, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 800.46/10-1554, NARA.

[49] The Japanese press, however, displayed no such sympathy and far greater misunderstanding. The American delegation's chairman, Harold Fisher, reported that local reporters were convinced that the Americans must be the staunchest of conservatives, and firm supporters of Senator Joseph McCarthy; how else would they have received permission to attend the conference? H.H. Fisher to Morden Murphy, Chairman, AIPR, Oct. 1, 1954, Box 25, Folder 14, IPR fonds, UBC.

[50] The secretary general remarked acidly that the weak American presence was "one more reflection of the current genius of the U.S. for isolating itself from the rest of the world." Holland to Prof. W. Macmahon Ball, University of Melbourne, Australia, Aug. 25, 1954, Box 41, Folder 2, IPR fonds, UBC.

[51] "IPR features US-UK clashes," *Japan News*, Oct. 5, 1954.

disappointed in the lack of diversity and expertise among the American delegates, Holland could only express thanks and relief that the American IPR was able to participate at all.[52]

Despite their relative lack of stature, the American delegation to Kyoto received plenty of attention in the local press, a fact that made American officials take note. Gregory Henderson, a foreign service officer who ran the American Cultural Center in Kyoto, kept watch on the IPR conference and found much to like about the delegation's performance. Henderson's report to the American embassy, which found its way to senior State Department officials in Washington, detailed the activities of the American delegation, which included numerous interviews with the local press and discussions with local Japanese leaders. Although Henderson noted that the Washington professor Charles Martin was the sole American delegate who reliably supported U.S. Asian policy in all aspects, the foreign service officer wrote that the others were at least fair, and did their best to keep most criticism "within the family." With the widespread Japanese interest in the IPR conference and the attendant heavy press coverage, Henderson concluded that "it is doubtful whether explanations of foreign policy have received so much prominent space in any similarly short period in the press of this [Kansai] region." Overall, he concluded, the delegation was uniformly "helpful … to the cause of American policy."[53] Here was a case in point for the public relations benefits of the American IPR: as an independent entity, the American group could act as an effective means for explaining United States policies in Asia at international conferences and at least receive an open hearing.

---

[52] For the many entreaties by William Holland to potential American delegates, see Box 41, Folder 1, IPR fonds, UBC.

[53] Gregory Henderson, Director, American Cultural Center, Kyoto, *Foreign Service Despatch No. 95*, Oct. 15, 1954, in RG 59, Central Decimal File, 800.46/10-1554, NARA.

The significance of the Kyoto gathering and the ongoing connections engendered through the IPR can be seen in relation to the more famous Bandung conference held less than one year later. On its own, the invitation by President Sukarno of Indonesia to host representatives of African and Asian nations—"Newly Emerging Forces," as he called them—was seen as a threatening move by some in the West. The prospect of cooperation between the principal organizing nations of India, Indonesia and China, in particular, raised fears about an anti-Western bloc. A ten-point "declaration on the promotion of world peace and cooperation" included a statement regarding the disavowal of collective defense treaties to serve the interests of big powers, a clear swipe against the newly formed SEATO. The Final Communiqué of the Bandung conference, in which these nations pledged greater direct technical assistance toward one another, also was noted as an act of independence from Western concerns.

Yet to see Bandung as an act of defiance against the West, as John Foster Dulles did, reflected a particular Cold War mentality rather than a reflection of the conference itself. Non-state actors associated with the IPR in attendance at the proceedings came away with a very different view. Angadipuram Appadorai, the secretary of the Indian Council of World Affairs, noted that delegates touted "mutual cooperation" but made no plans for setting up regional machinery or setting up any kind of exclusive arrangement that might limit contact with the West.[54] George McTurnan Kahin, the associate director of the Southeast Asia program at Cornell University, was traveling in Indonesia and managed to secure a press pass to the Bandung conference. The assertion of greater self-confidence by Asian and African peoples, Kahin wrote later, would in all likelihood mean that they would have a greater determination, not less, to share decisions with the

[54] Angadipuram Appadorai, *The Bandung Conference* (New Delhi: Indian Council of World Affairs, 1955), pp. 12-15.

West.[55] These observers and others had witnessed firsthand that a rising Asian sensibility did not on its own necessitate a break from Western contact.

The misreading of Bandung reflected the zero-sum geopolitical mentality of the Cold War, but it also reflected the preoccupation of viewing international relations through the lens of the nation-state. At the Kyoto conference, as at Lucknow before then, Western and Asian delegates understood that ideological and political differences separated them but did not prevent constructive regional dialogue at the private level. In fact, it was at the non-state level that greater understanding could be reached. The "true meeting-ground of East and West … begins with the recognition of impact of the past, of the years of colonial subjugation and its after-effects, of the blazing intoxication of pride and the muscle-flexing that comes with sudden self-government, of the drive to equality and self-respect," wrote the Filipino statesman Carlos Romulo in the wake of the Bandung conference.[56] Before nations could share foreign policies, they must begin to understand the deeper contexts in which these policies were formed. Pacific internationalists recognized the necessity of this exchange; Western policymakers, however, all too often viewed such substantive exchange as a threat.

CONCLUSION

In the wake of political troubles for the Institute of Pacific Relations in the early 1950s, Asian intellectuals did not withdraw from association; if anything, they clung more tightly to their best hope for substantive East-West collaboration and exchange. The IPR represented the strongest organization linking private elites in Asia—far stronger, for instance, than the Asian Regional Organization, which had done little since

---

[55] George McTurnur Kahin, *The Asian-African Conference, Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956), pp. 1-38.
[56] Carlos P. Romulo, *The Meaning of Bandung* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956), p. 57.

its creation at the 1947 Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi.[57] The McCarran hearings in the U.S. Senate had not weakened the IPR's reputation in Asia; in fact they served only to reinforce the Institute's brand as a truly independent organization in international affairs. The IPR had bolstered its Asian membership, so that India, Pakistan, Japan and now Indonesia constituted thriving national councils committed to ongoing research projects and an international conference program. When the IPR came under attack from one of its own—Ivison Macadam, of Britain's Chatham House—Asian delegates rushed to its aid. Their interest was not merely a show of sympathy. With a weakened American council and an ambivalent British group, Asian councils saw an opportunity to gain a greater position within the organization and finally shape the substantive agenda of the Institute's international work.

Despite its precarious status, the Institute's potential benefit to the United States remained real. Although IPR leaders had made it clear that they would not be pawns of the American government, some officials like Gregory Henderson saw a clear advantage to having such a private group explaining American policy to Asians. The White House also was beginning to recognize the value of private, non-governmental groups as intermediaries in its effort to promote more positive images of the United States abroad. In the summer of 1954, in the wake of the Geneva Conference, President Dwight D. Eisenhower asked Congress to appropriate $5 million toward a presidential emergency fund for cultural exchange initiatives; administration officials also organized a People-to-People campaign, an extensive state-private cooperative venture that encouraged ordinary Americans to engage in public relations work for the United States.[58] Clearly the U.S. government was awakening to the fact that private groups often had a great ability to

---

[57] See Chapter Four.
[58] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006), pp. 214-216.

sway foreign public opinion, and that prominent individuals, acting independent of the government, could be relied upon to humanize and perhaps strengthen the image of the United States. And with official concern about Asian powers turning against the West, any kind of private contact with the West surely would be encouraged. For the first time in years, IPR officials believed that their research and conference program might once again receive at least some quiet appreciation among higher circles.

Rather than see a revitalization of its programs, however, Institute officials found themselves once more on the defensive—this time, at the hands of the Internal Revenue Service. On May 26, 1955, T. Coleman Andrews, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and friend of Senator Joseph McCarthy, revoked the international Institute of Pacific Relations' tax-exempt status, retroactive to Jan. 1, 1955. The American IPR, as a member national council, was denied tax exemption two months later. Without citing any evidence, Andrews maintained that the IPR had "pursued its objectives through other than educational means" and had "to a substantial extent engaged in the dissemination of controversial and partisan propaganda." Virtually miming the charges laid out in the McCarran report from 1952, he charged that the IPR had "attempted to influence, directly or indirectly, the policies and/or actions of governments and government officials," presumably in relation to American policy in China during the 1940s.[59] IPR officials were unable to confront Andrews directly about these charges; the Commissioner of Internal Revenue resigned a few months later, citing (ironically enough) his opposition to the income tax.[60] Even the Institute's friends in the State Department were unable to intervene into a matter that would take years of expensive litigation to clear up. The IPR now was plunged into even greater financial uncertainty than ever before; indeed, for the

[59] Statement by Pacific Institute on Loss of Tax Exemption (press release), Oct. 18, 1955, in Box 41, Folder 5, IPR fonds, UBC.
[60] See interview with Andrews, "Why the Income Tax is Bad," *U.S. News and World Report*, May 25, 1956.

cash-strapped group, the revocation of tax-exemption represented a virtual death sentence.

Time and again, Western private and public officials paid lip service to the idea of opening up greater private channels of dialogue with Asia in the mid-1950s, but these efforts proved to be dysfunctional and even directly contradicted by their own actions. Ivison Macadam's 1953 proposal to dissolve the Institute of Pacific Relations revealed a strain of long-standing British ambivalence regarding the IPR, and highlighted the ambiguous relationship between the Commonwealth and other international organizations. In the United States, meanwhile, a new emphasis upon cultural diplomacy by the Eisenhower administration was countermanded by the residual impact of McCarthyism. U.S. foundations, businesses and government officials continued to distance themselves from the organization, leaving it slowly twisting in the wind and vulnerable to fresh attacks by the IRS by 1955. Yet despite these troubles, Asian members of the IPR stood by the Western-based Institute as the best hope for trans-Pacific intellectual exchange. Far from fleeing into the arms of anti-colonial compatriots in Africa, Asian intellectuals continued to reach out to friendly Westerners in the IPR, with hopes that a broader basis for "peaceful co-existence" might develop between them. The bogey of Bandung must be placed into the context of such evidence of active cooperation among Western and Asian elites.

Chapter Seven

Rethinking the East-West Connection, 1955-1960

By the latter half of the 1950s, a growing number of American politicians and foundation officials recognized that intellectual exchange between the West and Asia—an effort championed by the Institute of Pacific Relations since the 1920s—was not simply a matter of scholarly interest but was in fact a vital tool in the nation's struggle against global communism. The United States Information Agency (USIA) made partnerships with non-governmental bodies a critical component of its propaganda strategy in the Cold War, expanding its Office of Private Cooperation to coordinate new public relations programs in developing areas. As one historian of American Cold War propaganda has noted, the USIA especially targeted "leadership groups" in its attempts to win over elites and thereby create a kind of "ideational integration" between Americans and influential segments of foreign societies.[1] Partnering with non-governmental groups was seen as a valuable cover to disguise official efforts at winning over the "hearts and minds" of the developing non-communist world. Asia was a critical target for American propaganda, especially with the end of the direct U.S. occupation of Japan (1952) and the French withdrawal from Vietnam (1954). By 1960, more than a third of USIA's budget was devoted to projects in the region, especially Southeast Asia.[2]

Despite growing American interest in building intellectual networks with Asian elites, the 1950s also witnessed a critical decline of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, and indeed, the termination of the IPR's entire international structure by the

---

[1] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006), pp. 232-237.

[2] Osgood, *Total Cold War*, pp. 115-123.

end of the decade. This chapter provides a portrait of the Asia-centered non-governmental groups that overtook the IPR during its final years. Unlike the approach of the IPR, the new American links to Asia instead were defined by the Cold War paradigm. The Committee for Free Asia (later the Asia Foundation), for instance, was far more interested in the dissemination of pro-American propaganda in Asia than in serving as a neutral clearinghouse for political and economic research and debate across the Pacific. John D. Rockefeller III's Asia Society, meanwhile, eschewed potentially controversial political subjects entirely and instead focused on connecting Westerners and Asians through cultural exchanges such as dinners and art exhibits. By keeping its efforts focused on American audiences, the Asia Society avoided the charge of handing over control of its operations to foreign peoples and ideas inimical to the "national interest." As an international non-governmental group dealing with Asia-Pacific problems, the Institute of Pacific Relations was susceptible to such attacks in the United States.

American officials may have been concerned about the independence of a private international network like the IPR, but they were also concerned about the rise of pan-Asian groups that excluded Westerners. IPR leaders continued to defend their international organization across the Pacific as preferable to the Asian-only alternative. What turned out to be the IPR's final international conference, in Lahore, Pakistan, in 1958, served as a useful counterbalance to the more extreme variety of anti-Western propaganda issuing from contemporaneous conferences such as that in Cairo, which featured the launching of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO). As the decade came to a close, the IPR's efforts to forge an intellectual "bridge" across the Pacific Ocean were taken up by governmental bodies, specifically the creation of an East-West Center in Hawaii. The IPR's role had been superseded by governmental action, but

as United States officials quickly learned, building such connections was easier to assert than accomplish.

"A MORE COORDINATED APPROACH"

In the wake of the 1952 McCarran report, the American Institute of Pacific Relations found itself at a crossroads. The American council had weathered charges of political infiltration in the State Department and survived, but many of its supporters had fled during the Institute's season of notoriety, and its reputation was now badly weakened in the United States. Not only had some in Britain lost faith in the Institute's purpose, but many of its American backers were now turning tail. In a moment of frustration, William Holland, the Institute's secretary-general, confessed to University of British Columbia history professor Fred Soward in March 1953 that he was "furious and disgusted" that the wealthiest democracy in the world was unable to come up with enough funds and personnel to keep the American council fully functioning.[3] During the next few years, it became increasingly clear that the American IPR's name had suffered a mortal blow, and might need to be renamed and reorganized along new lines. But there were precious few ideas for replacing the American council as a coordinating body for Asian research in the United States, and as the American representative in the IPR's international organization. The need for such an organization was self-evident; the courage to continue the American council's work, however, was uncertain.

By the 1950s the Institute of Pacific Relations was hardly alone in the study of the Asia-Pacific region in the United States. Inspired by the pioneering work of the IPR and the new interest in the region since World War II, area studies programs covering the

---

[3] William L. Holland to Fred W. Soward, March 20, 1953, in Box 30, Folder 12, Institute of Pacific Relations fonds, University of British Columbia archives (UBC), Vancouver.

whole of Asia had developed in a number of American universities including Harvard University, Yale University, Columbia University, Cornell University, the University of Pennsylvania, the Johns Hopkins University, the University of Michigan, the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Washington. Other research centers such as Stanford University, the University of Chicago and the University of Minnesota featured specialized programs in the Far East or Southeast Asia.[4] All of these groups had strong ties with the American IPR; indeed, many of its leaders were current or former Institute members themselves. But now that universities were producing the vast majority of original research on Asia, some began to question the continued need to support the American IPR, especially given its political troubles. In the face of this new reality, Institute leaders focused more on their role as a clearinghouse for research, their ability to move between the worlds of scholarship, business and government, and especially their long-standing ties to Asian intellectuals. If the American group hoped to survive, it would need to undertake a major rebranding.

Sensing the need for such a comprehensive self-examination, American Institute leaders decided to place their fate in the hands of an independent Planning and Review Committee. In the spring of 1953, the president of Hunter College, George N. Shuster, informally agreed to serve as the Review Committee's chair. Upon hearing the news of Shuster's acceptance of the position, the chairman of the American IPR, J. Morden Murphy, wrote him directly to make a pitch for the continuation of the American group. As the Far Eastern representative for the Bankers Trust Company, Murphy noted that he had had the opportunity to meet with most of the financial and political leaders of Asia,

---

[4] A 1956 Conference on Asian Affairs study concluded that 60 percent of higher education institutions in the United States had at least one course dealing with Asia in their curriculum. This result might be read in another way: close to 40 percent of American universities had absolutely no course offerings on Asia. "Programs of American Institutions and Non-Profit Organizations Relating to Asia," n.d., in Box 32, Folder 11, IPR fonds, UBC.

and that in this capacity he had come to appreciate the work of the IPR as "a uniquely useful and practically irreplaceable organization, whose demise would be a great loss to all concerned."[5] Murphy, who only a few weeks earlier had agreed to take over the AIPR chairmanship himself, made note of the "obvious hazards" associated with linking one's name with such a controversial group so soon after the McCarran hearings, but was convinced he had found a fellow brave soul in Shuster: "Surely, the three hundred years it has taken our unique democracy to grow, were not spent to create an incubator for mice."[6] No sooner, however, had Shuster accepted the offer to review the American IPR's operations than he resigned to accept a more prestigious (and no doubt less controversial) full-time position offered by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: American representative to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).[7]

With the Planning and Review Committee's work in limbo, the prospects for the American council grew bleak. Many within the IPR were unsure of the wisdom of keeping the American council's name, given its notoriety within the United States. The American Institute of Pacific Relations, which in the early days had been the strongest of the national institutes, now threatened to poison other councils. Despite being a naturalized American citizen himself, William Holland as head of the international IPR was less concerned with the American group *per se* than the health of the international organization as a whole. Holland believed he had a way out of this conundrum: the replacement of the AIPR with an entirely new body. In a sweeping memorandum sent out to major supporters of the Institute, Holland called for the creation of a new non-

[5] Murphy to Shuster, July 21, 1953, in Box 30, Folder 10, IPR fonds, UBC.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Shuster served as the American representative to UNESCO until the early 1960s. George N. Shuster, *UNESCO: Assessment and Promise* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

partisan organization, a Coordinating Council on Asian Affairs. Such a council, he suggested, might relate the work of various university programs and even initiate experimental projects by bringing together businesses, scholars and governmental officials and thus prevent the overlapping of work. It would take on an even wider focus, encompassing East Asia, South Asia as well as the Middle East. And presumably, although Holland never explicitly stated as much, it might enable a continued American presence in the international IPR.[8]

Before any new Coordinating Council on Asian Affairs could come into existence, IPR leaders needed to visit their former backers at the Rockefeller Foundation to determine their level of enthusiasm for this venture. The Rockefeller Foundation had been the strongest supporters of IPR operations over the years. Institute leaders therefore believed they might be sympathetically inclined toward the group's reinvention. William Holland approached Dean Rusk, the new president of the Rockefeller Foundation, in February 1953 about the possible reorganization of the American IPR, and Rusk agreed to have a meeting with the outgoing American IPR chairman Gerald Swope, the 80-year-old former president of the General Electric Corporation.[9] But in the course of the next few months, it became clear that the Rusk-led Rockefeller Foundation was uninterested in rehabilitating the group, even under a new name. Skeptical about anything involving the Pacific institute, Rusk privately remarked to his colleagues that "serious questions about IPR … have not been fully answered in our minds" and thus he rejected any pleas for support.[10] By October 1953, top foundation officials had met with John D.

[8] W.L. Holland, "Memorandum on a more coordinated approach to the study of Asian problems," [n.d.], Rockefeller Foundation files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4201, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), Tarrytown, NY.
[9] W.L. Holland to Dean Rusk, Feb. 19, 1953, and Rusk to Holland, Feb. 26, 1953, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4201, RAC.
[10] Rusk made these comments in response to an American IPR invitation to take part in a Japanese-American conference in Hawaii earlier that year: "We do not plan to have a Rockefeller Foundation

Rockefeller III and made two conclusions seemingly at odds: one, that the mission of the international IPR had "demonstrated merit" performing functions that were of "increasing importance" to understanding the Pacific area; and two, that the American IPR should be allowed to "fade out" and have "nature … take its course without any nudging" from the Rockefellers themselves.[11] Only upon the death of the American IPR would the Rockefeller Foundation consider the merits of replacement groups. Foundation officials clearly did not lament the prospect of the passing away of a group that had brought them so much recent unwanted attention.

Rockefeller officials had reason to believe they might soon receive their wish. At a special session of the American Institute of Pacific Relations on October 9, 1953, the executive committee voted to recommend disbanding the organization on January 31, 1954. They were having trouble finding a replacement leader for the Planning and Review Committee, and furthermore, they could no longer escape the reality of their ongoing financial woes. Letters were sent to all 33 American IPR trustees, a majority of whom reluctantly agreed with the executive committee's decision to liquidate the American council.[12] Word spread throughout the country and even abroad; public encomia soon appeared, praising the group's past work and bemoaning its current predicament. "The members of the McCarthy wing of American politics can now add one more feather to their caps," lamented a December 1953 editorial in *The Eastern*

---

representative at the Honolulu IPR conference, nor to contribute Foundation funds for the support of the conference. We know that the American Council, IPR, is seriously considering complete liquidation; further, there are still some serious questions about IPR which have not been fully answered in our minds. Under the circumstances, we doubt that a further complication of the Foundation's role would be justified; or be offset by significant or lasting benefit from participation at Honolulu." Dean Rusk to Edgar B. Young, Dec. 19, 1952, in Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller–World Affairs files, RG III 2 Q, Series 213, Box 10, Folder 74, RAC.

[11] Interview, Joseph H. Willits and Roger F. Evans with John D. Rockefeller III, Oct. 30, 1953, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4202, RAC.

[12] Roger F. Evans, Interview with W.L. Holland, Oct. 22, 1953; Holland, Memorandum to AIPR Trustees, Oct. 26, 1953, both in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4202, RAC.

Economist, a business journal published in New Delhi.[13] Asians had come to trust the IPR as a respected independent voice, willing to stand up to the forces of McCarthyism. Reforming or reconstituting the American council would therefore be perceived as a capitulation to the "vociferous and ill-informed groups" that launched attacks against the IPR in recent years. *The Eastern Economist* concluded with a stern warning: "No other organization in Asia is now equipped sufficiently well to attempt to fill the vacuum if the International Secretariat is weakened in its work."[14] The imminent death of the American IPR, the journal believed, would not only affect American understanding of Asia but it would also have serious repercussions on the work of the international IPR.

As the potential impact of the loss of the American Institute sank in, some trustees began to rethink their willingness to oversee its dissolution. If the international IPR was so valuable, and American participation was so critical to its success, how could the American organization fold when there was no clear successor group?[15] Allowing the group to "fade out," as some in the Rockefeller Foundation had hoped, might not be the best course after all. Many trustees and members who had opposed the move to liquidate the group now recognized the need to act quickly and decisively to save the organization. Within a matter of weeks in November and December, American IPR supporters amassed

[13] "Exit of the I.P.R.," *Eastern Economist* (New Delhi), Dec. 11, 1953.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] David Mitrany, the foreign affairs adviser for the Lever Brothers of London, one of the most prominent British firms to back the IPR, wrote William Holland: "The position I have taken with our friends here," Mitrany wrote, "is that the IPR has over the years become an organization in which the Asian groups have grown accustomed to participate on an equal footing and with complete trust, in other words that it has become an important link for them with western Europe and especially with America, and that especially in conditions of tremendous change in Asia … it is difficult to overestimating the value of maintaining unimpaired that now well-established link and relationship. Would not a change in name and organization of the American IPR make the Asian groups feel, given the unfortunately growing suspicion of American policy, that something more fundamental has changed than a mere change of name and label? If there is any risk of this, then I should feel that much more would be saved by keeping the American IPR intact, even if dormant for a few years, than by making it lively at the price of such consequence." Mitrany to Holland, Dec. 9, 1954, in Box 29, Folder 6, IPR fonds, UBC.

emergency cash donations totaling $16,000. The fact that such money could be raised so quickly and on such short notice gave at least temporary hope that the infusion could stabilize the American group, and give it a stimulus upon which it might regain its financial footing. When the organization's executive committee held a special follow-up meeting on January 5, 1954, members reversed course from their October decision and instead unanimously voted to continue the council's operations. Once again, the American Institute of Pacific Relations had cheated death.[16]

Cheating death was one thing; ensuring survival was quite another. And even in this temporary resuscitation, the American Institute lost another ally. Members of the Institute of Pacific Relations of Hawaii, anticipating the demise of the American IPR, had voted in December 1953 to sever all ties with the American organization and change its name to the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council (PAAC). The IPR of Hawaii, whose original membership had helped found the Institute in 1925 and maintained healthy support, wished to separate formally from the mainland group and reconstitute itself as a purely local body. For years, Hawaii members, like some of their compatriots on the West Coast, had chafed at the New York leadership of the American IPR. The prospective liquidation of the American council, in their view, was an opportunity to make a clean break from the controversial group and re-establish Hawaii as a pre-eminent center for an Asian relations organization. The surprise resuscitation of the mainland group caught them off guard and caused considerable anxiety. Rather than congratulate the American council on its new lease on life, Hawaii members sent off angry missives demanding to know whether the vote was even legitimate and making it clear they would

---

[16] W.L. Holland, Letter to AIPR, Dec. 18, 1953, in RF files, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 353, Folder 4202, RAC.

not restore ties.[17] As the American IPR teetered into 1954, it was thus a mere shell of an organization, whose very existence annoyed both friends and foes alike. The group's dysfunctional nature only brought home the necessity of Holland's call for a "coordinated approach" to Asian affairs. But it was far from clear what organization, if not the American Institute of Pacific Relations, was prepared to assume that role.

ESTABLISHING THE ASIA SOCIETY

In the spring of 1954, the lawyer and diplomat Charles P. Noyes compiled a survey of American private activities in Asia on behalf of the Rockefeller Foundation. The Rockefellers were interested in sounding out the promise of philanthropic work on the continent. The Rockefeller family had been instrumental in creating the Japan Society in the early years of the twentieth century, and for years they had been the largest backers of the Institute of Pacific Relations, but now they sought to develop an Asian-wide organization of their own. Noyes was the man they hired to help see this vision come to fruition. During World War II Noyes had been an assistant to W. Averell Harriman, President Franklin D. Roosevelt's special representative in Great Britain, and after the war Noyes had served as a member of the United States Mission to the United Nations. Based upon his experience he was hired as a special consultant to the Rockefeller Brothers fund in the early 1950s.[18] Noyes was now put in charge of

---

[17] J.B. Atherton (President, IPR of Hawaii) to W.L. Holland, Nov. 17, 1953; Holland to Atherton, Nov. 16, 1953; Atherton to Holland, Dec. 8, 1953; Holland to Atherton, Dec. 10, 1953; Atherton to Holland, Dec. 18, 1953, all in Box 41, Folder 8, IPR fonds, UBC; also see Melvin Conant (Director, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council) to Holland, Jan. 4, 1954; Conant to Holland, Jan. 8, 1954; Holland to Conant, Jan. 9, 1954; Holland to Conant, Jan. 11, 1954; Conant to Holland, Jan. 12, 1954; Holland to Conant, Jan. 16, 1954, all in Box 42, Folder 3, IPR fonds, UBC.

[18] Noyes later would return to the United Nations as Minister-Counselor to the United States Mission under Adlai Stevenson from 1961 to 1965. "Charles P. Noyes, 82, Diplomat and Lawyer," *New York Times,* Jan. 7, 1994.

assessing the field of American private groups in Asia and recommending a course of action for the Rockefeller Foundation. His work became instrumental in the creation of the Rockefellers' new venture.

Noyes made clear that private work in Asia had great potential, and depicted newly independent Asian nations as practically begging for the help and advice of Westerners rather than seeking their own way forward. "In spite of their political anti-colonialism and neutralism, they are guided to a great extent by the values and mores of Western civilization," Noyes wrote. "They are seeking to emulate and catch up to the more advanced Western nations." The basic problem, however, was that the legacy of colonialism had prevented any cohesion from emerging among Asian countries, and yet such cohesion was essential if they hoped to withstand the pressures of Communist China. Noyes believed that Nehru's form of neutralism would have only limited success, and that Asians elsewhere were eager to develop closer ties of friendship and commerce with the West. He specifically cited Japan, Indonesia and the Philippines as sizeable countries who could develop into significant powers in their own right, and act as a bulwark against communism on the continent:

> They are the most important strategically for the United States and, if they remain friendly, could probably be held against Communist military pressure even if some of the mainland areas were lost. If they can be strengthened in their independence and come to have confidence in and friendship for the United States and each other, they might provide the nucleus of a stable Free Asia grouping.[19]

The larger geopolitical ramifications of private work in Asia were clear in Noyes' report. Private contact, in his view, was an essential component in supporting American anti-communist foreign policy and thus winning Asian minds.

---

[19] Charles P. Noyes, "Survey of American activities relating to Asia," April 14, 1954, Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, John D. Rockefeller III Papers, Box 42, Folder 388, RAC.

The Rockefellers were aware, however, that to be seen as a private agent of American foreign policy would undermine the credibility of any independent organization. Other groups working in the field already had been compromised through their overt political work. For instance, the Committee for Free Asia (founded in 1951) disseminated information throughout the continent to promote anti-communist movements, especially through broadcasts on Radio Free Asia emanating from the Philippines and Pakistan. Although the CFA's status as a Central Intelligence Agency front operation was not definitely established until the late 1960s, many Asian leaders on their own quickly recognized the group as mere propagandists and refused to work with it. India refused even to grant a visa to Robert Blum, the CFA's president. In 1953, the group underwent reorganization and changed its name to the Asia Foundation with headquarters in San Francisco. Lyman Hoover, the New York representative of the Asia Foundation who had spent time in China as a YMCA missionary, told the Rockefellers in early 1954 that the Asia Foundation was now trying to remove such overt ideological bias and "avoid the impression that it is a vehicle for a U.S. anti-communist crusade."[20] But the group nevertheless continued to accept secret CIA money and had an uncertain reputation among many independent Asian observers, including those associated with the IPR.[21]

[20] Luncheon with Lyman Hoover, Jan. 20, 1954, in Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, John D. Rockefeller III Papers, Box 42, Folder 387, RAC.

[21] William Holland kept the Institute of Pacific Relations away from any involvement with the Committee for Free Asia, but came to accept the Asia Foundation's claims to be independent and objective, and even tried to enlist their backing in some research projects. In a letter to Delmer Brown, of the Asia Foundation's Tokyo office, Holland urged Foundation officials to be more forthcoming regarding its finances to overcome such past suspicion: "I realize that the Foundation is doing a great deal of excellent work in a quiet way and that much of this is unknown or inadequately understood by the public. But unfortunately, and in many cases quite without justification, one hears suspicions expressed about the motives of the organization, its sources of support and its possible link with official agencies. I realize that this mostly an unfortunate carry-over of an earlier period, but just because of this I feel it would be well worthwhile to have a few more projects which were clearly and publicly associated with, or sponsored by,

If the Committee for Free Asia/Asia Foundation had a reputation for a strong political bias, other American institutions dealing with Asia were far more limited in scope, focusing almost entirely on specific educational programs. The American Council on Asian Affairs, for instance, was a tiny operation run out of Philadelphia by John Melby, a retired foreign service officer, who placed Asian teachers in American schools and helped arrange the shipment of school supplies across the Pacific. The China Institute of America, located in New York City and largely funded by Henry Luce, organized lectures and exhibits, while the Rockefeller's own New York-based Japan Society enabled activities like summer school programs in Japan. The Fund for Asia, Inc., meanwhile, led by the writer James Michener, sponsored teaching fellowships and scholarships to Asia. The Far Eastern Association (later renamed the Association for Asian Studies), founded in 1948, boasted some 800 members but drew entirely from universities, and had little contact in the business community or interest in pursuing a wider public program. As Noyes continued to put out feelers to corporations and other major benefactors like the Ford Foundation, he found strong interest in the Rockefellers' taking the initiative in launching a new umbrella private Asian organization within the United States.[22]

John D. Rockefeller III clearly saw an opening to take the lead in a general new Asian organization, but there remained the nagging issue of the American Institute of Pacific Relations. The American IPR almost certainly would dissolve with the creation

---

the Asia Foundation. Even now, I assure you, there are a number of otherwise well informed people, both Asians and Westerners, who have told me that the Committee for Free Asia up to quite recently was carrying on a number of secret or confidential activities, some of them along the lines of what used to be called clandestine operations in the O.S.S. [Office of Strategic Service] and O.W.I. [Office of War Information] psychological warfare division." Holland to Brown, Dec. 6, 1954, in Box 41, Folder 3, IPR fonds, UBC.

[22] Charles P. Noyes, memorandum, Dec. 7, 1955, in Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, John D. Rockefeller III Papers, Box 39, Folder 368, RAC.

of a new Rockefeller group, he believed, but how would the Rockefellers respond? Charles P. Noyes laid out the "problem of the IPR" to Rockefeller in a memorandum in late May 1955. Noyes set forth three possible courses of action: 1) take over the responsibilities of the American IPR within the international IPR; 2) encourage another body (like the Far Eastern Association) to do so, or 3) simply proceed with its plans without reference to the probable dissolution of the IPR. Noyes concluded that the third course of action entailed the least political risk in the United States, although he acknowledged the risks of hurting relations with other national councils in the IPR.[23] In the meantime, Rockefeller himself made clear in public and private conversations that he believed his Foundation should avoid any course of action that might involve them in the affairs of either the American or international IPR. "These feelings are based first, on the change in the situation in this country since the IPR was formed which renders it no longer necessary to have any organization to carry on many of its functions and, second, on the public feeling toward IPR," Rockefeller wrote to Hugh Borton of the East Asia Institute at Columbia University. "I am afraid that if a new Asian agency was in any way thought of as the IPR's successor its usefulness would be substantially vitiated in advance."[24] With this policy directive from the top, plans for the Rockefeller's Asian Society developed without any intention of assuming the responsibilities of the American IPR, or address (for the time being) any contemporary economic or political problems of the region.

However much Rockefeller wished to avoid the problems of the IPR, the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner's decision to withdraw the Institute's tax-exempt status

---

[23] Charles P. Noyes Memorandum to John D. Rockefeller III, "A New Asian Organization – The Problem of the Institute of Pacific Relations," May 26, 1955, in Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, Series 1, Sub-Series 3-Asian interests, Box 36, Folder 339, RAC.

[24] John D. Rockefeller III to Hugh Borton, May 31, 1955, in Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller – World Affairs files, RG III 2 Q, Series 213, Box 10, Folder 75, RAC.

in the summer of 1955 sent into turmoil his efforts to launch a new Asian organization. Throughout the fall, Rockefeller officials debated whether the IRS ruling was an attack on the IPR in particular, or meant as a warning to other related organizations. Rockefeller of course already had sufficient money on his own to fund his Asia organization, but he recognized that his venture required outside financial support in order to gain legitimacy. How would a group obtain such backing without the promise of tax-exempt status? One thing was certain: if the IPR protested the IRS ruling, the matter would be drawn into public debate. Any attempt to found a new Asian organization, regardless of its mission, would appear to be a successor group to the IPR, and would thus become a lightning rod for politically motivated attacks—the very thing Rockefeller wished to avoid. Top Rockefeller officials agreed in late 1955 that it would be "unwise and probably impractical" to establish a new Asian organization at that time, and matters were left to drift in this way for another year.[25]

In December of 1956, Rockefeller officials finally launched their new organization—the Asia Society—after it had become clear that the IPR's tax troubles would not affect them, and after receiving a multi-year pledge from the Ford Foundation.[26] Charles Noyes may have had ambitions regarding the organization's larger contribution toward the development of a "Free Asia," but Rockefeller Foundation officials had retreated from this broad international mission. Instead, they couched their program interests in decidedly apolitical terms: 1) education in the United States concerning Asia; 2) assistance to Asians who come to this country; and 3) encouragement

[25] Edgar B. Young and Charles P. Noyes, "Memorandum: A Possible Asian Organization" to John D. Rockefeller III, Oct. 14, 1955, Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, Series 1, Sub-series 3-Asian relations, Box 36, Folder 339, RAC.

[26] The significance of Ford Foundation support was not so much the amount--$25,000 per year for three years—but the fact that the Asia Society had the blessing not only of the Rockefeller Foundation but Ford as well. As William Holland remarked at the time, "That is quite a blessing!" Holland to A.S.B. Olver (Chatham House), Dec. 8, 1956, in Box 44, Folder 4, IPR fonds, UBC.

of cultural exchange as a basis of understanding and appreciation. A January 1957 press release offered the anodyne statement that the Asia Society would contribute to "the education of the United States public about the nations and people of Asia—their history, their culture and their way of life."[27] The society's first executive director was Paul Sherbert, a relatively unknown former American consul and public affairs officer in India. Its board of trustees, however, was formidable, including figures like Columbia University President Grayson Kirk, former US Ambassador to the United Nations Ernest Gross, former U.S. Ambassador to Thailand Edwin Stanton, and Pan American World Airways President Juan Trippe.

Rockefeller could not avoid all criticism. The IPR's old nemesis, Alfred Kohlberg, wrote to Rockefeller, complaining that some of the Asia Society's board members had past ties to the American IPR and that none had actively exposed communist infiltration. Rockefeller carefully avoided future correspondence with the persistent critic and he caused no future trouble.[28] Overall, the creation of the Asia Society was greeted with enthusiasm among most Asian specialists in the United States. If anything, its supporters wished that the Asia Society would take on more, not less. The society's original program of dinners and exhibits sounded cautious, to be sure, but many in the IPR still held out hope that as the McCarthy era faded, the Rockefellers might soon take on the responsibility of spearheading a broader agenda for trans-Pacific research and

---

[27] Press release, Jan. 1, 1957, Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, John D. Rockefeller III Papers, Box 36, Folder 341, RAC.

[28] Rockefeller wrote to Kohlberg that he was "confident that all the Trustees are aware" of the history of the IPR and that they have in mind the "best interests of the United States." Kohlberg responded: "I am indeed devastated by your reply. … I shudder to think what will become of your new Asia Society under their direction." Edgar B. Young, a Rockefeller Foundation official, proposed circulating copies of Kohlberg's letters to Asia Society board members. Rockefeller did so, and also informed his board that he did not intend to engage Kohlberg regarding the Asia Society in the future—a tactic that apparently had its desired effect. Rockefeller to Kohlberg, Dec. 18, 1956; Kohlberg to Rockefeller, Dec. 20, 1956; Young to Rockefeller, Dec. 21, 1956; Rockefeller to Board members, Jan. 2, 1957, all in Rockefeller Family files, RG 5, John D. Rockefeller III Papers, Box 36, Folder 341, RAC.

debate on contemporary political and economic matters, and eventually take part in the international IPR.[29]

THE LAHORE CONFERENCE, 1958

Despite the predictions of the Asia Society's new leadership, the Institute of Pacific Relations did not close up shop, at least not immediately. First off, the IPR had a tax case to fight. Sympathetic attorneys volunteered to work on the Institute's behalf to restore its tax exemption, but they could only do so if the group remained intact. IPR leaders also carried on with their international program of research. They continued to edit and publish the group's journal, *Pacific Affairs*. They also planned and executed what would become the Institute's final international conference, held in Lahore, Pakistan in February 1958. There they formally accepted a new national council (Burma) into the IPR fold. And they continued to bide their time, hoping that within a year or two prominent American corporate and foundation leaders would realize that U.S. support of such an international confederation was in the national interest, and either sponsor a successor organization or bolster their own. "As an American I say this with some shame, but in the belief that they eventually do come to their senses," Holland wrote leaders of the national councils in the fall of 1957.[30] Holland was right that American leaders would soon wake up and recognize the need for greater contact between Western and Asian elites, but not in the way he predicted. The U.S. government now stepped in where non-governmental groups had been toiling for decades. By the close of the

---

[29] One American IPR member, Donald Straus, suggested that the AIPR dissolve immediately – "commit ceremonial suicide on the doorstep of the Asia Society" – and thereby force the Rockefellers to assume the AIPR's functions, but this view was not shared by many others. W.L. Holland to Ernest A. Gross, March 29, 1957, in Box 33, Folder 16, IPR fonds, UBC.

[30] W.L. Holland, "Memorandum on the Future of the I.P.R.," Nov. 19, 1957, in Box 44, Folder 15, IPR fonds, UBC.

decade, as the IPR shut its doors for good, U.S. congressmen and White House officials were busily engaged with the supposedly novel task of forging a network of Western and Asian elites. The American government had entered into the business of intellectual bridge-building across the Pacific.

For years, IPR leaders recognized the value in having governmental officials on their side. Now, as their tax case wound its way through the court system, the Institute enlisted prominent friends to appeal to members of the State Department in order to intervene with the Treasury Department, but little public help was forthcoming. American IPR Chairman J. Morden Murphy and other colleagues wrote Undersecretary of State Christian Herter in a futile attempt to speed up their case and to convey the potentially dire consequences of the IRS commissioner's decision. David Mitrany, of London's Lever Brothers firm, wrote Herter that if the IPR were forced out of business, no successor group could re-establish the same ties in Asia:

> It seems therefore both sad and perplexing that, at a time when we in the West find it so difficult to gain and keep the confidence of those who shape opinion in those distant countries, we should also deliberately undermine, and perhaps ultimately destroy, one of the very few organizations which can provide an invaluable degree of mutual trust, on the grounds of old connections and affection and allegiance.[31]

Meanwhile, Walter Nash, a long-time IPR supporter who had recently become New Zealand's prime minister, heard about the Institute's tax situation at the 1958 SEATO conference in Manila and immediately approached Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, telling him that the American government should "stop this nonsense and recognize the usefulness of the IPR."[32] Despite these direct appeals, neither Dulles nor Herter made

[31] David Mitrany to Hon. Christian A. Herter, Jan. 10, 1958, in Box 38, Folder 9, IPR fonds, UBC.

[32] William Holland, in relating this story to Barbara Tuchman, another old IPR friend, noted that Dulles, while apparently relatively well informed on the subject, merely listened to Nash's plea on the IPR's behalf: "I doubt if [Dulles] did anything about it afterwards, but it's nice to have a prime minister rooting for us." Holland to Tuchman, June 17, 1958, in Box 40, Folder 2, IPR fonds, UBC.

any moves to intervene in the IPR's case, however privately sympathetic they may have been to the Institute's plight.

Out of the spotlight, mid-level State Department officials continued to cooperate with the IPR's programs, especially in the context of the Institute's Lahore conference in February 1958. Walter S. Robertson, assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs, who otherwise was a staunch conservative regarding Asian affairs,[33] maintained a friendly correspondence with William Holland and provided American delegates to the conference multiple copies of recent official statements regarding U.S. foreign policy in Asia. Robertson also directed the Consul General in Lahore, Andrew V. Corry, as well as the local United States Information Service office to provide help to the American delegation. Besides overseeing the distribution of various position papers, Corry ended up hosting a reception for the dozen American delegates, including Professor and Mrs. Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago and Douglass Cater, then a young Washington editor of *The Reporter.*[34] The IPR and the State Department both benefited through this arrangement. Robertson certainly saw the unofficial gathering as an opportunity to clarify any "misunderstanding" of American policy on the part of Asian delegates, while Holland was notably pleased to renew contacts with official Washington. Holland commended the "efficient and courteous cooperation" extended to American IPR delegates during the Lahore conference, and warmly thanked both the Consulate and the USIS for their help.[35]

---

[33] Robertson served as assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs from April 1953 through June 1959, and was known best for his strident opposition to the diplomatic recognition of Communist China. E.W. Kenworthy, "Robertson Quits as Aide to Dulles," *New York Times,* April 2, 1959.

[34] Wright, an international law expert at the University of Chicago, was the unofficial leader of the American delegation. Cater, in Pakistan on a fellowship, would later serve as a special assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson, focusing on federal aid for education and the establishment of the Public Broadcasting System.

[35] W.L. Holland to Walter S. Robertson, Jan. 3, 1958; Robertson to Holland, Jan. 20, 1958; Holland to Robertson, Feb. 18, 1958, all in Box 39, Folder 6, IPR fonds, UBC.

But even as Holland congratulated himself on renewing these official ties, the Consulate Office in Lahore dispatched its own report on the IPR conference back to Washington, painting a far muddier picture of the American delegation's impact on Asian opinion. Consul General Corry wrote that in some cases the American delegates generated more adverse publicity than positive views of American foreign policy. One notable instance was a lecture given by conference participant Ralph Braibanti of Duke University, who spoke on the SEATO pact at the Political Science Club of the University of the Panjab during a break in the conference. Corry complained that Braibanti focused almost exclusively on negative aspects of the pact. The result was predictable: the next day, a headline in *The Pakistan Times* declared: "SEATO Ineffective Organisation: US Professor Analyses Pact's Provisions."[36] This was not just a matter of editorial manipulation; USIS officials in attendance at Braibanti's lecture reported that if anything, the report was "milder than the speech itself."[37] Corry's skeptical report to his State Department superiors merely demonstrated the almost untenable position the American IPR was in by the late 1950's. The Institute was pleading for survival in the United States based on its position as an independent voice in international affairs, yet such independence signaled deviation from official policy in the eyes of the State Department, criticism that presumably must be minimized in the public relations battle for Asian minds.

Even if the IPR's Lahore conference itself did not succeed in ingratiating the Institute to official Washington, at the very least it provided an important symbol of the ongoing potential of East-West interchange. The theme of the conference, "Problems of

---

[36] *Pakistan Times*, Feb. 7, 1958.

[37] Andrew V. Corry, American Consul General, Lahore, to The Department of State, Washington, March 28, 1958, in Record Group 59, Central Decimal File, 800.46/3-2858, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, MD.

Foreign Policy in Southern and Eastern Asia," did not lack scope, nor did it shy away from potential controversy. Eleven national councils sent delegates, totaling some 100 people, from Australia, Great Britain, Canada, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United States, and the newest admitted council, Burma. Observers attended from the United Nations Technical Assistance Board, the International Labor Office and the Asia Foundation. With the cooperation of the Provisional Government of West Pakistan, meetings were held in the West Pakistan Assembly Chamber. Pakistan's Minister of Finance, Amjad Ali, opened the conference, flying in from Karachi specifically for the occasion, and the subsequent proceedings were fully covered by the local media, especially the Lahore and Karachi newspapers.[38] Sharp exchanges were heard, to be sure, especially when Asian voices spoke up against the supposed injustices of the West, but tempers were held in check and most found the discussions worthwhile—valuable, if nothing else, for throwing light on the "states of mind" in Asian countries concerning policies enacted in the region.[39]

Of particular significance at the conference was the final roundtable on the incipient "non-aligned" movement and the Afro-Asian outlook on world affairs. Here, in the concluding discussion of what would be the final international conference held by the IPR, the Institute's approach was best on display. The following exchange was typical of the conference. An Indian delegate[40] first stated the rationale for the non-aligned movement; someone, he said, must play the vital role of mediator between nuclear-armed power blocs. A British delegate chimed in, complaining that non-aligned states were drawing a dangerous moral equivalence between communism and the West. An

[38] "The Thirteenth IPR Conference at Lahore," American Institute of Pacific Relations Annual Report 1957-58, in Box 45, Folder 9, IPR fonds, UBC.

[39] Quincy Wright to Hon. Christian Herter, Feb. 27, 1958, in Box 40, Folder 6, IPR fonds, UBC.

[40] Names were not recorded in the minutes, in order to allow for the maximum free exchange of views.

Australian delegate wondered aloud whether newly independent Asian and African states were pursuing similar imperialist policies to the Western ones they decried. An American delegate then spoke up, saying that it was perfectly natural that newly independent states should wish to break out independently in foreign relations, and that the West had no right to lecture Asians and Africans regarding the development of their own policies. A Japanese delegate expressed horror over the birth of a new Afro-Asian "bloc." Finally, the chairman of the conference, A.B.A. Haleem, head of the Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, brought the proceedings to a close. There would be no Afro-Asian bloc, Haleem predicted. Asians and Africans had no racial commonality, he explained, while Muslims had no racial consciousness at all. The West, he concluded, had nothing to fear from "the bogey of a strong Asian color consciousness."[41] In the course of this single roundtable discussion, delegates had aired strong opinions, sometimes even criticizing their own countries, but ultimately they arrived at a sensible middle ground that emphasized the potential of East-West partnership. It was the IPR method, encapsulated.

The Institute's conference in Lahore stressed moderation, but such pronouncements alone could not slay the bogey of an anti-Western bloc. In fact, the bogey had just been revitalized in Cairo at the inaugural meeting of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, held in the last days of 1957 at the expressed invitation of Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. This conference brought together delegates from several Asian, Arab and African "solidarity committees"—non-governmental organizations led by well-known communist activists "masquerading in the colours of

[41] M. Brecher (Canada), Rapporteur's Report of Concluding Round Table, Feb. 12, 1958, 13th IPR Conference, Lahore, in Box 75, Folder 5, IPR fonds, UBC.

Bandung," according to British officials.[42] The Cairo conference only exacerbated the polarizing tendencies of the Cold War, and reignited old fears by American and British officials alike regarding Afro-Asian solidarity. Significantly, the Cairo conference also renewed fears regarding the supposed communist takeover of international non-governmental organizations. Why were non-governmental groups rather than governments represented at Cairo? Communists, the theory went, bypassed governments, especially when those governments were not amenable to communism. "Communists are primarily concerned with winning over the people," one British Foreign Office memorandum concluded forebodingly.[43] Such sentiments crystallized the difficulties facing the IPR during the late 1950s. Private international communication was itself now cause for suspicion. Such was the logic of the Cold War.

Some leaders of the Institute of Pacific Relations thought that the Cairo conference would help their cause, in highlighting the contrast between such an explicitly anti-Western group and the IPR's more inclusive gathering at Lahore.[44] But if anything, the Cairo gathering demonstrated even more clearly to Western officials that non-governmental organizations dealing with international relations were susceptible to insidious left-wing influences and were by their very nature beyond the control of official diplomatic machinery. The IPR was by no means a subversive organization—Institute leaders had made special efforts to reach out to American officials during the Lahore conference, and were eager to make a good impression to overseas diplomats—but the IPR was decidedly independent, and its open and frank conference format consistently

---

[42] Foreign Office telegram No. 366 to Addis Ababa, Oct. 17, 1957, in DO 35/6100, The National Archives (TNA), Kew, United Kingdom.

[43] Foreign Office telegram No. 1866, Nov. 14, 1957, in DO 35/6100, TNA.

[44] Mary Healy, Holland's assistant in the international secretariat office, asked Harold Fisher to mention the Cairo conference in a letter to Undersecretary of State Christian Herter. Healy to Fisher, Jan. 30, 1958, in Box 75, Folder 5, IPR fonds, UBC.

produced unreliable support for Western policies in Asia. As a result, the Institute received only lukewarm backing among diplomatic officials, certainly not enough to reverse its terminal decline. At the close of the 1950s, Western officials began thinking anew about the best ways to win over Asian minds to anti-communism. With the IPR model of the private international relations organization now in tatters, they began trying to build an entirely new intellectual bridge across the Pacific.

THE EAST-WEST CENTER: A NEW BRIDGE?

On April 16, 1959, U.S. Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson spoke at the National Women's Press Club and announced a bold new proposal: the creation of an international center in Hawaii "to attract scholars and students alike from both the Orient and the Occident."[45] Hawaii had been granted American statehood less than a month before, and Johnson was prepared to capitalize on the news. He had been in close contact with Ford Foundation officials as well as John A. Burns, the Hawaiian delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, regarding the potential strategic impact of an East-West center. Burns in particular peppered Johnson with memoranda extolling the virtues of such an idea. One such note from Burns included a statement from a "top-flight source … very much in line with my thinking" that claimed "the most graphic and dramatic answer to communist propaganda is Hawaii."[46] Communists had been adept at using "Little Rock" propaganda to exploit the United States' problems regarding racial integration, but in Hawaii, races worked alongside one another in tolerance and mutual

[45] Dai Ho Chun, Director, International Cooperation Center, Hawaii, to Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson, April 21, 1959, in U.S. Senate papers, Lyndon B. Johnson sponsored legislation (1949-60), Box 306, Folder S.2123—East-West Cultural Center, Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library (LBJ), Austin, TX.

[46] John A. Burns to Lyndon B. Johnson, anonymous attachment [n.d.], U.S. Senate papers, Johnson sponsored legislation (1949-60), Box 307, Folder S.3385—East-West Cultural Center, LBJ.

respect, thus making it a valuable Cold War asset. The city of Honolulu could be worth "millions of dollars as Western propaganda if its story could reach the millions of non-Caucasians whom the communists are subverting in the 'battle for the minds of men,'" Burns' source concluded.[47] Almost 25 years after the founding of the IPR, Hawaii once again took center stage as a model for East-West reconciliation, but this time, it had the imprimatur of the American government.

Top educators convened by Johnson to discuss his proposal were thrilled by the idea of a federally chartered institution in Hawaii. They recommended that the project focus on mature students and especially faculty, with particular attention on the teaching of teachers in such areas as economic development, public administration, agricultural education, and health and nutrition. The Hawaii center, in their minds, would be a place to train the next generation of Asian leaders, as well as bring together top experts on various issues from both the West and Asia. But while the panel recognized the importance of federal help, it also was aware of the potential backlash. The project could not succeed, they concluded, if Asians believed the center was a tool in the Cold War. "The Asians must be assured that we are doing this out of a sincere desire to help them and to broaden our understanding," the panel explained.[48] All agreed that the center would be a success only if it were given the appropriate funding: at least $50 million in startup costs, with an additional $10 million anticipated for yearly operational expenses. The center promised enormous geopolitical dividends, but first required significant financial investment.

---

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] Solis Horwitz and James W. Wilson to Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson, "Educators' Recommendations on Hawaii Proposal," April 27, 1957, in U.S. Senate Papers, Johnson-sponsored legislation, Box 307, Folder S.3385—Hawaii—East-West memos, LBJ.

On June 9, 1959, Johnson formally introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate to establish a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. The legislation was brought forward as part of the Mutual Security Act of 1959, in support of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 as well as a previous Mutual Security Act of 1954. The purpose of the new act—to promote "better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study and research"—read as if cribbed from the IPR's constitution.[49] But if the edifice for this understanding had been in the process of construction for some time among high-minded private citizens, Johnson spoke as if he were laying the first stone. The East-West Center proposal, he claimed, was "the foundation for what I envision as an intellectual bridge, joining together the best of the East and the West."[50] In scope and ambition, perhaps, Johnson had reason to be optimistic. Backed with millions of federal dollars, the East-West Center had the potential to do far more educational and cultural exchange work than the IPR had ever envisioned. The center could become a kind of institute of advanced study, bringing in top-drawer experts from around the world to discuss contemporary political and economic problems in a setting where they could learn from one another. And as a multinational association bridging West and East, the center could serve as a useful counterweight to the drift toward pan-Asianism.

Johnson's original expansive vision for the East-West Center, however, was waylaid almost immediately. The act placed the onus for the center's implementation in the hands of the Department of State, which promptly began to scale back the ambitious proposal. No doubt, the East-West Center threatened to step on the toes of existing

---

[49] Senate Bill 2135, 80th Congress, 1st Session, June 9, 1959, in U.S. Senate Papers, Johnson-sponsored legislation, Box 306, Folder S.2135—Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, LBJ.

[50] Discussion of Proposal to Establish Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, excerpts from *Congressional Record*, June and July 1959, in *Ibid.*

bureaucracies like the USIS and other public relations agencies. As State Department officials wrangled over the details, Johnson's proposal was increasingly watered down, and quickly subsumed within an existing plan by the University of Hawaii to expand its undergraduate program to encompass more scholarships and exchanges and the construction of some new facilities. No longer was the center to be a federally chartered independent institution, but instead run through the University of Hawaii. The plan for the center needed to be "realistic," a December 1959 State Department report concluded. "The University [of Hawaii] and other facilities involved should not be burdened with a program beyond their capabilities …"[51] William Gibbons of the Democratic Publicity Committee, Johnson's point person on the center, relayed the bad news to Johnson: the new plan, Gibbons wrote, "raises serious doubts as to whether the plan carries out your original idea."[52]

Other supporters of the original East-West Center proposal idea were crestfallen. Gillespie S. Evans, an 18-year veteran of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange program, privately confided his disappointment to Gibbons. Evans' reading of the center's original plan had given him hope that it might function as a kind of "permanent interparliamentary union," with leaders from governments, universities and business confronting the hard realities of the United States position in Asia. Evans envisioned a kind of perpetual IPR conference, whose recommendations could help guide policies for the region. Instead, the revised proposal now focused entirely on long-term goals designed to build up influence in Asia from the grass-roots over a period of years. Such influence that may never materialize, Evans wrote, and certainly not in time before a

---

[51] "A Plan for the Establishment in Hawaii of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West," January 1960, in *Ibid*.

[52] Bill Gibbons to Senator Johnson, Memorandum, Feb. 26, 1960, in U.S. Senate papers – LBJ sponsored legislation (1949-1960), Box 307, Folder S.3385 – Hawaii—East-West memos, LBJ.

major "moment of truth" fell upon the United States in Asia.[53] Writing in 1960, Evans perhaps sensed better than most the potential constellation of events that could drag the United States more deeply into Vietnam.

As the East-West Center's plans were gummed up within Washington bureaucracy, the Soviets managed a public relations coup by announcing a similar initiative of their own. During a trip to Indonesia in February 1960, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev announced the creation of the University of Friendship of Peoples, a tuition-free technical institution in Moscow for students from Asia, Africa and Latin America.[54] First-year enrollment anticipated 500 students, growing to as many as 4,000 in a few years. The news certainly highlighted the problems in launching Johnson's initiative. A *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* editorial demanded that Congress break the impasse and appropriate the funds to get the project moving. The newspaper's editor, Riley H. Allen, forwarded the editorial to Senator Johnson, pointing out the obvious consequences of inaction. The United States could not afford to fall behind the Soviet Union in the race for third-world minds, any more than they could afford to fall behind in the race for armaments.[55]

The East-West Center finally launched on October 25, 1960, when the Department of State signed a grant-in-aid agreement with the University of Hawaii, which in turn agreed to administer the center through allocated federal funds. Johnson's original "bridge" concept for the center had given way to a more conventional university program, but its name and mission at the very least retained important political

---

[53] Gillespie S. Evans to William Gibbons, May 4, 1960, in U.S. Senate papers – LBJ sponsored legislation (1949-1960), Box 769, Folder: Foreign Relations—East-West Cultural Center (1), LBJ.

[54] Max Frankel, "Moscow to Open Alien University," *New York Times*, Feb. 24, 1960.

[55] *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* editorial, March 3, 1960; Riley H. Allen to Lyndon B. Johnson, March 2, 1960, in U.S. Senate papers – LBJ sponsored legislation (1949-1960), Box 306, Folder S.2135-- Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, LBJ.

symbolism. The following spring, Johnson, now the U.S. vice president, flew to Honolulu to dedicate the center. He told the assembled crowd that the center's opening was "one of the most personally gratifying moments of my public life," and made the bold prediction that "of the works to which I have contributed I have the greatest confidence that this East-West Center will outlive them all."[56] He stressed the differences between the Soviet model of education and that of the United States. And in words that echoed his original proposal two years before, he stressed the ability to overcome the division across the Pacific Ocean: "The oldest such division which tyrants have used against peace and freedom is the division between East and West. It is this division which we must end to clear the way to a world where peace is universal and freedom is universally secure."[57] As President John F. Kennedy entered office with bold new international initiatives like the Peace Corps, such a world seemed more possible than even a few years before.

Amid the celebrated unveiling of the East-West Center and the arrival of a new American presidential administration, however, a quieter loss took place. After 35 years of operation, the international Institute of Pacific Relations dissolved in October 1960; the American Institute of Pacific Relations followed one year later. Both groups survived long enough to witness a final victory in court in their struggle to regain tax-exempt status. After years of Treasury Department foot-dragging, the U.S. District Court of New York ruled in March 1960 that the U.S. government had failed to produce any evidence to support the charges of former IRS Commissioner Coleman Andrews, and thus vindicated the Institute's status as a non-partisan organization.[58] But depleted of funds

[56] Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Address, Dedication of East-West Center, May 9, 1961, in Presidential papers (1963-1969), S. Douglass Cater files, Box 48, Folder: Meeting of National Review Board of East-West Center at White House (1965), LBJ.
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] W.L. Holland, press release [n.d.], in Box 98, Folder 4, IPR fonds, UBC.

and exhausted from a decade of political battles, the Institute's leaders saw no way to go on. William Holland, who had almost single-handedly run the American and international institutes in their waning years, accepted a position as Asian Studies professor at the University of British Columbia. The university also agreed to take on the responsibility of publishing *Pacific Affairs.* Up until the end, national councils, especially in Asia, argued against the IPR's dissolution, but moral support could not pay the bills.[59] As institutes of international affairs, these national councils found new sources of support and reoriented their work, changed names, or dissolved themselves.

As a new decade dawned, there appeared to be little support for an international non-governmental organization dealing with Asian affairs. The U.S. State Department may have entered into the business of forging intellectual connections between Westerners and Asians, but its political motivations were all too apparent and its efforts were often thwarted by U.S. policies themselves. But even as William Holland packed up the belongings of the IPR from its New York office, he rejected the notion that the IPR's mission had become irrelevant. In a letter to American IPR trustees in the summer of 1960, Holland noted that it would simply take a "few public spirited citizens" to restore the tradition of "open free-swinging debate on difficult and delicate issues of Asian policy."[60] The refusal of the Asia Society to take on this role was a "discouraging" commentary on American leadership, it was true. The failure to create a new independent organization to help the public better understand future regional challenges "would be a tragedy, indeed a disgrace," Holland wrote.[61] There existed a great number of thoughtful Americans who recognized the importance of a rapidly changing Asia and

[59] H.H. Fisher, Chairman, IPR Pacific Council, to Pacific Council members and national secretaries, [n.d. 1961], in Box 98, Folder 4, IPR fonds, UBC.
[60] W.L. Holland to American IPR Trustees, Aug. 22, 1960, in Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller—World Affairs files, RG III 2 Q, Series 213, Box 10, Folder 75, RAC.
[61] *Ibid.*

the challenge to Western policies. But how would this be expressed without institutional coordination?

From within the organization of the IPR, the dreams of Pacific internationalism appeared to be less feasible than ever in 1960. American foundations had withdrawn support and focused upon U.S.-centered educational programs rather than private international work. The American government lacked a coherent program to win Asian minds. But outside the United States, the private connections established by the IPR would reconfigure themselves in subsequent years. This new generation of Pacific internationalists would find revitalized energy in the promotion of regional economic collaboration. The deepening crisis of the Vietnam War, meanwhile, would offer both a case study in the need for greater understanding between the West and Asia, as well as the basis for the establishment of new regional strategic partnerships. The end of the IPR thus represented a dream delayed, not denied.

Epilogue

The Legacy of Pacific Cooperation

The dissolution of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1961 did not extinguish its animating principles. In fact, the IPR's demise coincided with a renewed attention to Asia-Pacific regionalism by Western and Asian governments and non-state actors alike. The Cold War, and especially the conflict in Vietnam, intensified American interest in Asian regionalist schemes during the mid- and late-1960s. Beyond the specific political objectives of that era, the effort to create broader Pacific-Asian economic ties has extended into the 21st century and has encompassed official as well as private interests. In the last few decades, the proliferation and effectiveness of international non-governmental organizations have continued to vindicate the IPR model of bringing together diplomatic, business and academic elites to discuss regional issues and harmonize interests across the Pacific. But the establishment of an Asia-Pacific identity and institutionalized economic collaboration among Pacific countries is far from a realized dream. As American hegemony in the Pacific has declined, intellectuals and governmental officials are again reviewing fundamental assumptions regarding the economic and geopolitical relationship between the "West" and the "rest."[1]

The IPR's vision of trans-Pacific partnership, if not the Institute itself, outlasted two major competing approaches by the 1960s. The first was the Commonwealth idea espoused by Great Britain and the so-called "Old Dominions" of Canada, Australia and New Zealand.[2] Some Chatham House leaders maintained after World War II that the loss

---

[1] Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008).
[2] For the best short survey on the establishment of the Commonwealth, see J.D.B Miller, *Britain and the Old Dominions* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967). A more substantial treatment of the theme is Nicholas Mansergh, *The Commonwealth Experience* (New York: Praeger, 1969).

of the IPR would have no great impact upon its relations with Asian intellectuals since the British Commonwealth had expanded to become a multi-racial community, anchored by the participation of India, and linked through various institutes of international affairs. The Commonwealth model, according to this view, was not only an idealistic means to retain links to an imperial past, but a vital link between Asia (and Africa) and the West.[3] By the late 1950s, however, specifically during the crisis over the Suez Canal, the Commonwealth's serviceability as a cultural bridge suffered major setbacks. Sir John Slessor, a former Royal Air Force chief of staff, wrote historian C. E. Carrington in September of 1956 (even before the failed military attack on Egypt), noting that the short-term damage to British morale from the Suez crisis paled in comparison to the more serious damage to "the really big issue of the second half of the 20th century—the struggle for the minds of the peoples in the uncommitted nations of Asia, and to a less extent Africa."[4] Suez was merely was the most dramatic example of Britain's shrinking global influence. Over subsequent years, Great Britain lost its ability to serve as a neutral arbiter for trans-Pacific intellectual exchange.[5]

More concrete institutional troubles also plagued the Commonwealth project. A series of unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conferences, held roughly every five years since 1933, drew together members of the various institutes of international affairs in the Old Dominions as well as newer Commonwealth countries in Asia and Africa.[6] These

---

[3]Many imperial scholars touted this expansive notion of the possible transformative role for the Commonwealth. Frederick Madden and D.K. Fieldhouse, eds., *Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth: Essays Presented to Sir Edgar Williams* (London: Croom Helm, 1982); also see R.J. Moore, *Making the New Commonwealth* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[4] Sir John Slessor to Professor C.E. Carrington, Sept. 18, 1956, copy in CHA 7/10/7a, general correspondence, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House (CHA), London.

[5] For more about the impact of the crisis, see Wm. Roger Louis and Roger Owen, eds., *Suez 1956: The Crisis and Its Consequences* (London: Clarendon Press, 1989).

[6] For a history of these conferences during their heyday, see W. David McIntyre, "The Unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conferences, 1933-59: Precursors of the Tri-sector Commonwealth," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* Vol. 36, No. 4 (Dec. 2008): 591-614.

gatherings were originally inspired by IPR meetings, and eventually came to be viewed by some as a potential successor to the faltering Pacific institute. But by the early 1960s, the conferences suffered both from the withdrawal of philanthropic support by the Carnegie Corporation as well as a lack of representation from Asian and African countries, few of which fielded institutes of international relations built on the Chatham House model. Moreover, Britain's attempt to join the European Economic Community provoked additional questions regarding the Commonwealth's potential to become a truly meaningful international association. The Commonwealth Relations Conferences limped into the 1960s before quietly disbanding.[7]

A more direct challenge to the IPR vision came from the prospect of a so-called "third world" line-up against the West. The creation of the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) at a Cairo conference in 1957-58 was the best-known non-governmental attempt to forge a popular international movement out of the spirit of neutralism first developed at the 1955 Asian-African conference in Bandung, Indonesia. Communist China emerged as an influential leader of AAPSO, which sought to support the liberation struggles of colonized and oppressed peoples around the world. AAPSO offered the Chinese a chance to demonstrate their regional interest in Asian and African affairs, but this relationship quickly turned sour. Chinese members increasingly took a hard communist line, eroding their influence among the "non-aligned" nations such as Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Egypt.[8] Most importantly, the Chinese suppression of the Tibetan revolt in 1959 and the subsequent flight of the Dalai Lama to India severed the diplomatic links between Peking and New Delhi. In the fall of 1962, the eruption of the

---

[7] See the minutes from the Seventh Commonwealth Relations conference, New Delhi, Jan. 7-15, 1965; as well as conference report by Chatham House Director Kenneth Younger, Jan. 21, 1965, in CHA 7/7/1, Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), London.

[8] Charles Neuhauser, *Third World Politics: China and the Afro-Asian People's [sic] Solidarity Organization, 1957-1967* (Cambridge: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University Press, 1968), 1-19.

Sino-Indian War signaled a dramatic end to the potential all-Asian regional partnerships proposed only a few years earlier.

With the British Commonwealth and third-world solidarity models largely abandoned by the early 1960s, the United States began to take the lead in promoting regional organization in Asia. Drawing upon efforts to build European and Latin American regional alliances, and seizing upon a thaw in Soviet-American relations in the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis, some U.S. governmental officials touted the idea that regional associations could reduce the tendency towards dangerous nationalism in Asia and help better coordinate American commitments there. President Lyndon Johnson already had demonstrated his inclination toward encouraging a "Free Asia" regional sensibility during his senatorial leadership for the creation of Hawaii's East-West Center in 1960. A decisive moment arrived, however, with President Johnson's decision to escalate the Vietnam War in March 1965. Because the American bombing campaign and the introduction of U.S. troops into Vietnam had the potential to cause region-wide instability, Johnson felt compelled to undertake a broad review of American policy there. In an April 7, 1965 speech at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Johnson announced that he was throwing his weight behind greater sub-regional cooperation in Southeast Asia, stressing its benefits on social and economic conditions:

> These countries of Southeast Asia are homes for millions of impoverished people. Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle through until the night to wrestle existence from the soil. … Stability and peace do not come easily in such a land. … The American people have helped generously in times past in these works. Now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in that conflict-torn corner of the world. The first step is for the countries of Southeast Asia to associate themselves in a greatly expanded cooperative effort for development. … The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and the existence of more than a hundred million people.[9]

---

[9] Lyndon B. Johnson, April 7, 1965, quoted in W.W. Rostow, *The United States and the Regional Organization of Asia and the Pacific, 1965-1985* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 6-7.

Johnson's regional vision for Asia was intimately tied up with his commitment to economic justice—a sort of Great Society for the world. Within months of the speech, the United States began to support the creation of an Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC), the latter consisting of a nine-nation economic and political consultative body.

Hidden beneath Johnson's rhetoric promoting regional economic uplift were hard strategic calculations based on the war in Vietnam—a fact that created its own impetus toward regional alliance. Some Asian countries had soldiers committed to the defense of South Vietnam, and wished to coordinate their efforts with their Western partners. The leaders of these nations (Australia, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, the United States and Vietnam) met in Manila for a conference in October 1966. The Manila Declaration, issued on October 25, 1966, declared not only their collective resolve to support the United States' effort in Vietnam, but espoused larger regional aspirations.[10] Western newspapers touted the Manila Declaration as a new dawn in Asian relations with the West. In an editorial entitled "New Building Blocs for Asia," *Fortune* magazine reported that the threat of an anti-Western Asian bloc had now receded into the past:

> A decade ago, a good part of that world, by then reconstituted as so-called "emerging" nations, was oscillating wildly, between the pulls of Peking and Moscow, on the one hand, and, on the other, the seductive, silken attractions of Nehru's vision of a Third Force. It was at Manila finally that the Asian and Pacific countries had the good sense to come together—under the shield of American power, to be sure—and begin the process of looking to one another for support, purpose and weight in the power balance.[11]

---

[10] "We, the seven nations gathered in Manila, declare our unity, our resolve, and our purpose in seeking together the goals of freedom in Viet-Nam and in the Asian and Pacific areas. They are: 1. To be free from aggression; 2. To conquer hunger, illiteracy and disease; 3. To build a region of security, order, and progress; 4. To seek reconciliation and peace throughout Asia and the Pacific." Rostow, *The United States and the Regional Organization of Asia and the Pacific,* p. 12.

[11] Charles J. V. Murphy, "New Building Blocs for Asia," *Fortune* (Dec. 1966), pp. 133-34.

The task of containing communism in Southeast Asia, in this view, was part of a larger effort to give these nations time to find common ground. The conflict in Vietnam merely crystallized the shared interests of the Asian nations who had rallied to support the American cause.

In addition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam, political developments in Southeast Asia—specifically in Indonesia—furthered the potential for at least sub-regional organization. In the early 1960s, the Indonesian President Sukarno had openly challenged the Malayan federation as a British neocolonial venture, and launched what became known as the policy of Confrontation (*Konfrontasi*), creating a situation that in itself, prevented regional collaboration from getting underway. But in late 1965, a failed coup exposed the tensions within Sukarno's political coalition, and over the next few months he began to lose power to Major General Suharto, who eventually forced Sukarno to relinquish the presidency in early 1967. As a staunch anti-communist, the new president Suharto now actively sought ties with fellow anti-communist Asian nations. The product of this outreach was the establishment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in August 1967. For the next several years, foreign ministers and even heads of state of participating countries used ASEAN as a means to promote economic and cultural cooperation, as well as discuss political and security issues. By the middle of the 1970s, ASEAN established a permanent secretariat in Jakarta, and earned a reputation as the best-organized sub-regional inter-governmental organization in the Asia-Pacific region.[12]

Cooperation among Southeast Asian countries was one thing; Pacific-wide regional collaboration was quite another. The only region-wide inter-governmental body in the postwar period was the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia

[12] Derek McDougall, *Asia-Pacific in World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007), pp. 299-303.

and the Far East (ECAFE).[13] From the late 1940s onward, ECAFE served a critical role not only in helping to develop the ideas behind the Asian Development Bank, but also in providing institutional support for numerous economists interested in regional trade cooperation. One such economist was the head of Japan's Economic Planning Agency, Saburo Okita, who had contributed to both IPR and ECAFE publications. As Asia-Pacific scholar Lawrence T. Woods has noted, Okita's decision in 1963 to leave ECAFE and lead the newly created Japan Economic Research Center (JERC) was an important moment in the first "rekindling of interest" in non-governmental Pacific cooperation since the collapse of the IPR.[14] Two years later, another Japanese economist, Kiyoshi Kojima, first aired a proposal to create a Pacific Free Trade Area (PAFTA), an idea that led directly to the Pacific Trade and Development Conference (PAFTAD) series beginning in 1967. Whereas IPR conferences in earlier years were constitutionally barred from promoting specific agendas such as trade liberalization, PAFTAD conferences were under no such constraints. The fact that most members were economists committed to free-trade principles made this grouping an even more explicit "epistemic community" designed around the advancement of liberal economic ideas.[15]

Somewhat closer to the IPR spirit was the decision in the late 1970s to create a broad coalition of non-governmental figures to discuss regional problems with an economic focus. In the spring of 1979, Masayoshi Ohira and Malcolm Fraser, the respective prime ministers of Japan and Australia, proposed a "Pacific Community

[13] Established on March 28, 1947, ECAFE was a parallel institution to other United Nations regional commissions created in Europe and later in Latin America and Africa. ECAFE is now identified as the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). Rostow, *The United States and the Regional Organization of Asia and the Pacific,* pp. 18-21.

[14] Woods is one of the few specialists in Asia-Pacific regional organization to pay particular attention to the importance of non-governmental groups. Lawrence T. Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy: Nongovernmental Organizations and International Relations* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993), pp. 37-40.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 41-65.

seminar" to convene business, academic and governmental figures from around the Pacific region. The result was the launching of the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC) at an inaugural meeting in September 1980 in Canberra, Australia. Rather than focusing on particular state interests, this private and informal gathering assembled representatives from 11 different "economies"—Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Malaysia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and (eventually) the United States—as well as three Pacific Island states of Papua New Guinea, Fiji and Tonga. The PECC's mission was to promote the idea of economic interdependence within the region and thereby develop a larger Pacific community—sentiments that closely echoed the first IPR gatherings. The fact that the United States participated in, but did not dominate PECC proceedings, no doubt would have pleased former IPR stalwarts. Throughout the 1980s, the PECC held almost annual gatherings and instituted a series of task forces on a number of issues such as minerals and energy, trade policy, foreign investment, and fisheries.[16]

The presence of PECC along with the economists associated with the Pacific Trade and Development conferences (PAFTAD) were critical factors in creating a coherent intellectual community that promoted regional economic trade liberalization for the Asia-Pacific region in the 1980s, and reflected the importance of non-governmental actors.[17] Such private international activity also was a significant factor in promoting inter-governmental regional economic collaboration later in the decade. In the early 1980s, governmental officials were wary of Pacific-wide cooperation. Leaders of ASEAN, for example, did not wish to marginalize their organization within a larger Pacific conglomeration; meanwhile, the United States in the early years of the Reagan

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 89-125.
[17] John Ravenhill, *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 50-54.

administration focused more on global trade liberalization rather than regional solutions. But within a few years this reluctance eroded. The rapid growth of East Asian economies, Japan's growing investment in Asian manufacturing, and the increasing percentage of American trade with Asia-Pacific countries (which by mid-decade outstripped US trade with Europe by $26 billion) suddenly made regional inter-governmental economic collaboration an attractive proposition. The presence of private groups like PECC and PAFTAD were institutional reminders that regional approaches could complement rather than compete with projects for liberalizing trade. With the thawing of the Cold War and the resulting uncertainty about the region's future, the United States found itself more willing to enter into collaborative economic initiatives in the Asia-Pacific region to secure its interests.[18]

The manifestation of this change of heart came in 1989 with the creation of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), an inter-governmental grouping proposed by Australian and Japanese leaders, with inaugural members including Australia, Japan, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, South Korea, and the six ASEAN countries.[19] The purpose of APEC was to reduce trade barriers according to the principle of "open regionalism"—in other words, any lowering of trade restrictions would be extended to member and nonmember countries alike. Rather than merely becoming another trading bloc, APEC reflected a non-discriminatory Asian-Pacific regional identity that embraced globalization. "We are fully aware that a regional community without a perspective for a global community, a regionalism that excludes globalism, has no possibility of development and prosperity," concluded a Pacific Basin study group initiated by Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira in 1979, enunciating principles that would

---

[18] Ravenhill, *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism*, pp. 84-89.

[19] China joined in 1991, along with Taiwan and Hong Kong as "economies." Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Chile, Peru, Russia and Vietnam all became members during the 1990s.

become the cornerstone of APEC ten years later.[20] With the end of the Cold War, it appeared for the first time that regional governments themselves were on the cusp of fashioning an Asia-Pacific sensibility, the fulfillment of a vision that had stretched back to the end of World War I.

Although APEC represented the best potential for inter-governmental construction of a new trans-Pacific community, its central mission of trade liberalization proved to have a weak foundation. During the Asian financial crises of 1997-98, when a widespread collapse in currencies and stock values plunged the region into economic and political chaos, APEC's feeble response disappointed the hopes of many. Furthermore, Western and Asian members diverged in their analyses of the cause of the crisis. Western governments continued to tout economic liberalization, placing the blame on the shoulders of Asian domestic policies and refusing the Japanese and Taiwanese proposal for an Asian monetary fund separate from that of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Angry at the Western response, some Asian APEC members revived a 1990 proposal by Mahathir bin Mohamad, the prime minister of Malaysia, to establish an East Asian Economic Group that would exclude the United States and other Western nations.[21] The basis of such a group focused on meetings between ASEAN members and China, Japan and South Korea—a configuration known as ASEAN Plus Three (APT). Since its establishment in 1997, APT has touted itself as a potential rival to other regional associations like the European Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement, and has taken the lead in holding regular East Asia summits.[22]

---

[20] Quoted in Ravenhill, *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism*, p. 54.
[21] McDougall, *Asia-Pacific in World Politics*, pp. 306-308.
[22] The first East Asia Summit was held in December 2005 in Malaysia; since then, two more took place in the Philippines (Jan. 2007) and Singapore (Nov. 2007). A fourth is scheduled in Thailand (Oct. 2009).

The East Asia summits and the accompanying discussions of a potential East Asian Community represent a challenge not only to the "open regional" economic grouping advocated by APEC, but more broadly to the trans-Pacific association of peoples advocated by the Pan-Pacific Union and Institute of Pacific Relations as far back as World War I. For much of the past century, a similar dynamic has manifested itself: Western nations have lived in fear of an organized Asia hostile to Western interests. In the 1930s and 1940s, this threat took the form of the Japanese Economic Co-Prosperity Sphere. In the aftermath of World War II, the threat transformed itself into that of Afro-Asian solidarity and third-world neutralism in the context of the Cold War. Throughout these tumultuous years, Pacific internationalists maintained a vision of East-West partnership that attempted to transcend geopolitical realities of the day and maintain dialogue on common interests.

The legacy of Pacific internationalists should be seen not simply through recent efforts at economic cooperation but also through "track-two" unofficial dialogue regarding Asia-Pacific security matters. The most important international non-governmental group to take up this challenge is the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP), launched in 1993 and comprised of representatives from the business, academic and diplomatic communities in Asia, North America and even Europe. As a regional confidence-building institution, CSCAP more closely resembles the Institute of Pacific Relations than perhaps any other group of its kind. Supporters of the CSCAP method recognize that considerable constraints operate against the overt success of these non-governmental efforts, yet nevertheless there are many "measured optimists" who believe in exploring new forms of security cooperation outside of a balance-of-power model.[23] It is difficult to measure the degree of success of

[23] Paul M. Evans, "Assessing the ARF and CSCAP," in Hung-Mao Tien and Tun-Jen Cheng, eds., *The Security Environment in the Asia-Pacific* (New York: East Gate Books, 2000), pp. 154-157.

organizations like the CSCAP yet their continued growth and activity suggests the importance of such non-governmental gatherings to more formal diplomatic exchange.

If the last century was the American Century, will the next finally usher in the much-discussed Pacific Century?[24] And if so, what will be the place of the United States (and more broadly, "the West") in this new international order? Scholars only recently have come to grips with the ideology and practice of American imperialism. Far fewer have outlined the way in which the United States can adapt itself to a post-hegemonic future in the context of a reinvigorated and perhaps more united Asian continent.[25] Already in ways large and small, nations around the world are questioning American leadership on global issues from the fight against terrorism to nuclear proliferation and climate change. Meanwhile, the Asian "march to modernity" offers intriguing glimpses into the power and potential of this dynamic region. The West's decision to respond to these developments with either paranoia or partnership will largely determine the history of the next century. The ability of non-state actors to pressure nation-states to uphold democratic ideals, furthermore, will continue to measure our progress toward Edward Carter's gracious world society.

---

[24]For commentary on the rise and fall of this much-debated idea, see Editorial, "The Pacific Century," *Third World Quarterly,* Vol. 12, Nos. 3-4 (1990-91): v-vii; Ravi Arvind Palat, "Pacific Century: Myth or Reality?" *Theory and Society*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (June 1996): 303-347; and Rosemary Foot and Andrew Walter, "Whatever Happened to the Pacific Century?," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25 (Dec. 1999): 245-269.

[25] A few notable works to grapple with the prospect of the end of American global dominance include Kishore Mahbubani, *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2008); Parag Khanna, *The Second World* (New York: Random House, 2008); and Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008).

Bibliography

Archival sources

Columbia University archives, Butler Library, New York, NY.
Carnegie Corporation collection.
Pacific Relations collection.

Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.
Stanley K. Hornbeck papers.

Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
Philip C. Jessup papers.

Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, Austin, TX.
U.S. Senate papers.
Vice-Presidential papers.
Presidential papers.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Paris, France.
Direction Asie-Océanie.

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.
RG 59, Department of State.

Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, NY.
Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller—World Affairs files.
Rockefeller Family files.
Rockefeller Foundation files.

Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House, London, United Kingdom.
Commonwealth Relations Committee.
Pacific Relations Committee.

The National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom.
Colonial Office files.
Dominion Office files.
Foreign Office files.

University of British Columbia archives, UBC Library, Vancouver, British Columbia.
Institute of Pacific Relations fonds.

University of Vermont archives, Bailey/Howe Library, Burlington, VT.
Edward C. Carter papers.

Newspapers and periodicals

Eastern Economist (India)
Economist (U.K.)
Far Eastern Survey
Fortune
Honolulu Star-Bulletin
Japan News (Japan)
Life
Mainichi (Japan)
Manchester Guardian (U.K.)
National Call (India)
New York Times
Nippon Times (Japan)
Pacific Affairs
Pakistan Times (Pakistan)
Saturday Evening Post
U.S. News and World Report

Published IPR conference proceedings

Institute of Pacific Relations. *First Conference, Honolulu, 1925.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Condliffe, J.B., ed. *Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 15 to 29, 1927.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

______. *Problems of the Pacific, 1929: Proceedings of the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Nara and Kyoto, Japan, October 23 to November 9, 1929.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Lasker, Bruno, ed. *Problems of the Pacific, 1931: Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow and Shanghai, China, October 21 to November 2.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

______. *Problems of the Pacific, 1933: Economic Control and Conflict. Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Banff, Canada, 14-26 August, 1933.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Holland, W.L. and Kate Mitchell, eds. *Problems of the Pacific, 1936: Aims and Results of Social and Economic Policies in Pacific Countries. Proceedings of the Sixth*

Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Yosemite National Park, California, 15-29 August 1936. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

______. *Problems of the Pacific, 1939: Proceedings of the Study Meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Virginia Beach, Virginia, November 18-December 2, 1939.* New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940.

Institute of Pacific Relations. *War and Peace in the Pacific: Preliminary Report of the Eighth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations on Wartime and Post-war Cooperation of the United Nations in the Pacific and the Far East, Mount Tremblant, Quebec, December 4-14, 1942*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943.

______. *Security in the Pacific: A Preliminary Report of the Ninth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hot Springs, Virginia, January 6-17, 1945*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1945.

______. *Problems of Economic Reconstruction in the Far East: Report of the Tenth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Stratford-on-Avon, England, September 5-20, 1947.* New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1949.

Holland, William L, ed. *Asian Nationalism and the West: A Symposium Based on Documents and Reports of the Eleventh Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1953.

Books and articles

Akami, Tomoko. *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in Peace and War*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Appadorai, Angadipuram. *The Bandung Conference.* New Delhi: Indian Council of World Affairs, 1955.

Bayly, Christopher and Tim Harper. *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941-1945.* London: Allen Lane, 2004.

Belmonte, Laura. *Selling the American Way: U.S. Propaganda and the Cold War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Bender, Thomas, ed. *Rethinking American History in a Global Age.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Bhushan, Shashi, ed. *Twenty Years of Bandung and Problems of Peace and Security in Asia: A Collection of Articles.* Bombay: Allied Publishers Private Ltd., 1975.

Bisson, T.A. *American Policy in the Far East, 1931-1941.* New York: International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941.

Biswas, Chitta. *The Relevance of Bandung: Thirtieth Anniversary of the Bandung Conference.* Cairo: Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization, 1985.

Blum, John Morton, ed. *The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Borgwardt, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Brands, H.W. *Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Brewer, Susan A. *To Win the Peace: British Propaganda in the United States During World War II*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Calvocoressi, Peter. *Threading My Way.* London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1994.

Chow, S.R. *Winning the Peace in the Pacific.* New York: Macmillan, 1944.

Corbett, P.E. *Post-War Worlds.* New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1942.

Culver, John C. and John Hyde. *American Dreamer: The Life and Times of Henry A. Wallace.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2000.

Curtis, Lionel. *Civitas Dei.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Dennis, Donald Philips. *Foreign Policy in a Democracy: The Role of the Foreign Policy Association.* New York: Foreign Policy Association, 2002.

Dunch, Ryan. "Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity." *History and Theory* 41, No. 3 (Oct. 2002): 301-325.

Foot, Rosemary and Andrew Walter. "Whatever Happened to the Pacific Century?" *Review of International Studies* 25 (Dec. 1999): 245-269.

Gallagher, John and Ronald Robinson. "The Imperialism of Free Trade." *Economic History Review* 6, No. 1 (1953): 1-15.

Gopal, D., ed. *Asian Relations: Report of the Proceedings and Documentation of the First Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, March April 1947.* 2nd ed. New Delhi: Authorspress, 2003.

Grose, Peter. *Continuing the Inquiry: The Council on Foreign Relations From 1921 to 1996.* New York: The Council on Foreign Relations, 1996.

Haas, Peter M. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46, No. 1 (Winter 1992): 1-35.

Henderson, William. "The Development of Regionalism in Southeast Asia." *International Organization* 9, No. 4 (Nov. 1955): 463-476.

Hooper, Paul F. *Elusive Destiny: The Internationalist Movement in Modern Hawaii.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980.

______. "The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Origins of Asian and Pacific Studies." *Pacific Affairs* 61, No. 1 (Spring 1988): 98-121.

______, ed. *Rediscovering the IPR: Proceedings of the First International Research Conference on the Institute of Pacific Relations: University of Hawaii, August 9-10, 1993.* Manoa, Hawaii: Center for Arts and Humanities, University of Hawaii, 1994.

______, ed. *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations: The Memoirs of William L. Holland*. Tokyo: Ryukei shosha, 1995.

Hopkins, A.G., ed. *Globalization in World History.* New York: Norton, 2002.

Hu, Shizhang. *Stanley Hornbeck and the Open Door Policy, 1919-1937.* Westport, Conn: Greenport Press, 1995.

Hyam, Ronald. *Britain's Declining Empire: The Road to Decolonization, 1918-1968*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Kahin, George McTurnur. *The Asian-African Conference, Bandung, Indonesia, April 1955.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956.

Kendle, John. *The Round Table Movement and Imperial Union.* Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Khanna, Parag. *The Second World.* New York: Random House, 2008.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Kubek, Anthony. *How the Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China, 1941-1949.* Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1963.

Lang, Laszlo, ed. *Bandung—Thirty Years After.* Budapest: Hungarian Peace Council, 1985.

Latham, Robert. *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Lattimore, Owen. *Ordeal by Slander.* Boston, Little, Brown, 1950.

Lattimore, Owen with Fujiko Isono. *China Memoirs: Chiang Kai-shek and the War Against Japan.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1990.

Lavin, Deborah. *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Lawrence, Mark Atwood. *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Leffler, Melvyn P. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1993.

______. *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.

Levering, Ralph B. *The Public and American Foreign Policy, 1918-1978*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1978.

Linebarger, Paul M.A. "The Struggle for the Mind of Asia." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 278 (Nov. 1951): 32-37.

Louis, Wm. Roger. *Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Louis, Wm. Roger and Roger Owen, eds. *Suez 1956: The Crisis and Its Consequences.* London: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Louis, Wm. Roger and Ronald Robinson. "The Imperialism of Decolonization." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* XXII, No. 3 (Sept. 1994): 462-511.

Lucas, Scott. *Freedom's War: The US Crusade Against the Soviet Union, 1945-56.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Mack, Andrew and John Ravenhill, eds. *Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific Region.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.

Madden, Frederick and D.K. Fieldhouse, eds. *Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth: Essays Presented to Sir Edgar Williams.* London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Mahbubani, Kishore. *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East.* New York: PublicAffairs, 2008.

Mansergh, Nicholas. *The Commonwealth Experience.* New York: Praeger, 1969.

Mazlish, Bruce and Ralph Buultjens, eds. *Conceptualizing Global History.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

Mazlish, Bruce and Akira Iriye, eds. *The Global History Reader.* New York: Routledge, 2005.

McDougall, Derek. *Asia-Pacific in World Politics.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 2007.

McIntyre, W. David. "The Unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conferences, 1933-59: Precursors of the Tri-sector Commonwealth." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36, No. 4 (Dec. 2008): 591-614.

McMahon, Robert J. *Colonialism and Cold War: The United States and the Struggle for Indonesian Independence, 1945-49.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981.

______.*The Limits of Empire: the United States and Southeast Asia since World War II.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Mehta, G.L. "Asian Nationalism Vis-à-vis Other Asian Nations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 318 (July 1958): 89-96.

Miller, J.D.B. *Britain and the Old Dominions.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967.

Moore, R.J. *Making the New Commonwealth.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Neuhauser, Charles. *Third World Politics: China and the Afro-Asian People's [sic] Solidarity Organization, 1957-1967.* Cambridge: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University Press, 1968.

Newman, Robert P. *Owen Lattimore and the 'Loss' of China.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Nicholas, H.G., ed. *Washington Despatches, 1941-1945: Weekly Political Reports from the British Embassy*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1981.

Osgood, Kenneth. *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad.* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006.

Oshinsky, David M. *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy*. New York: The Free Press, 1983.

"The Pacific Century." Editorial, *Third World Quarterly* 12, Nos. 3-4 (1990-91): i-vii.

Palat, Ravi Arvind. "Pacific Century: Myth or Reality?" *Theory and Society* 25, No. 3 (June 1996): 303-347.

Panikkar, K.M. *The Future of South-East Asia: An Indian View*. New York: Macmillian, 1943.

Parmar, Inderjeet. *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of the Role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939-1945*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Ravenhill, John. *APEC and the Construction of Pacific Rim Regionalism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Recto, Claro M. *Three Years of Enemy Occupation: The Issue of Political Collaboration in the Philippines.* Manila: People's Publishers, 1946.

Romulo, Carlos P. *The Meaning of Bandung*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956.

Rosenberg, Emily S. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

Rostow, W.W. *The United States and the Regional Organization of Asia and the Pacific, 1965-1985*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1986.

Sasaki, Yutoko. "The Struggle for Scholarly Objectivity: Unofficial Diplomacy and the Institute of Pacific Relations from the Sino-Japanese War to the McCarthy Era." Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 2005.

Segal, Gerald. *Rethinking the Pacific.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Shuster, George N. *UNESCO: Assessment and Promise.* New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Soesastro, Hadi and Christopher Findlay, eds. *Reshaping the Asia Pacific Economic Order.* Oxford: Routledge, 2007.

Sofer, Sasson. "Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited." *Review of International Studies* 14, No. 3 (July 1988): 195-211.

Spalding, Elizabeth Edwards. *The First Cold Warrior: Harry Truman, Containment, and the Remaking of Liberal Internationalism.* Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006.

Stead, W.T. *The Americanization of the World: Or the Trend of the Twentieth Century.* London: Horace Markley, 1902.

Stiglitz, Joseph. *Globalization and its Discontents.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2002.

Strange, Susan. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Streit, Clarence K. *Union Now: The Proposal for Inter-Democracy Federal Union.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

Tarling, Nicholas. *The Fall of Imperial Britain in Southeast Asia.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Thampi, Madhavi, ed., *India and China in the Colonial World.* New Delhi: Social Science Press, 2005.

Thomas, John N. *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974.

Thorne, Christopher G. *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War Against Japan*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

______. "Chatham House, Whitehall, and Far Eastern Issues: 1941-45." *International Affairs* 54, No. 1 (Jan. 1978): 1-29.

Tien, Hung-Mao and Tun-Jen Cheng, eds. *The Security Environment in the Asia-Pacific.* New York: East Gate Books, 2000.

Tomlinson, John. *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

United States Senate. *Hearings Before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary.* 15 vols. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1952.

Utley, Freda. *The China Story.* Chicago: Regnery, 1951.

Van der Kroef, Justus Maria. *The Lives of SEATO.* Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1976.

Wala, Michael. *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War*. Providence: Berghahn Books, 1994.

Wallace, Henry A. *Our Job in the Pacific.* New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1944.

Watt, D. Cameron. *Succeeding John Bull: America in Britain's Place, 1900-1975* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Wilbur, Ray L. *Memoirs.* Edgar Eugene Robinson and Paul Carroll Edwards, editors. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1960.

Winkler, Allan M. *The Politics of Propaganda: The Office of War Information, 1942-1945.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Woods, Lawrence T. *Asian-Pacific Diplomacy: Nongovernmental Organizations and International Relations*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993.

______. "Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Institute of Pacific Relations: A Reappraisal of Long-term Mutual Dependency." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 10, No. 2 (1999): 151-166.

Yamaoka, Michio and George M. Oshiro, eds. *Toward the Construction of a New Discipline: International Conference Proceedings on the Re-evaluation of the Institute of Pacific Relations.* Tokyo: Ronsosha, 2005.

Ybarra, Michael J. *Washington Gone Crazy: Senator Pat McCarran and the Great American Communist Hunt.* Hanover, NH: Steerforth Press, 2004.

Zakaria, Fareed. *The Post-American World.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2008.

Vita

Michael Richard Anderson attended Woodberry Forest School in Virginia. Upon graduation in 1994, he attended Culford School in Suffolk, England as an English-Speaking Union scholar. In 1995 he entered the University of Virginia, from which he earned his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1999. For the next two years he taught modern history at Bryanston School in Dorset, England. In 2001 he enrolled in the Graduate School at the University of Texas at Austin, where he earned a Masters of Arts in 2003. From 2005-2007 he was an adjunct assistant professor at Austin Community College. In the summer of 2007, he participated in a month-long International Decolonization Seminar through the National History Center in Washington, DC. Since 2008 he has been an instructor at the University of Texas.

Permanent address: 7001 Rufus Drive, Austin, Texas 78752

This dissertation was typed by the author.