

# The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Origins of Asian and Pacific Studies

Paul F. Hooper

WESTERN, PARTICULARLY NORTH AMERICAN, SCHOLARS of Asia and the Pacific work amidst an abundance of materials, research programs, funding sources and the other features characteristic of major academic endeavors. Most have never known other circumstances. Given the relative sufficiency of their surroundings, many of these scholars—especially those trained since mid-century—may be unaware that the academic structure they depend upon dates back only five or six decades and was developed by a pioneering generation of scholars who, although diminished in number, are still present and peripherally active. As recently as the late 1920s, there were no mechanisms for the systematic study of either Asia or the Pacific—no graduate programs, no research centers, no professional associations, no regular conferences, and no substantial library collections. Indeed, aside from the early efforts of a few like George H. Blakeslee, Stanley K. Hornbeck, and Kenneth S. Latourette, there were not even elementary courses offered through organized departments.

A good number of these scholars may also be unaware that the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization prominent from the late 1920s to the mid 1950s but now largely unknown except to older scholars, is almost solely responsible for changing these conditions. Through an extensive series of conferences on Asian and Pacific issues and a highly productive collaborative research program focused upon related topics, it laid the foundation for modern Asian and Pacific studies in the West.

The Institute's achievements in research are especially significant. The classic studies of Asia and the Pacific during the 1930s, 1940s and early 1950s—works such as J. Lossing Buck's *Land Utilization in China*, George McT. Kahin's *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, Felix M. Keessing's *Modern Samoa*, Owen Lattimore's *Inner Asian Frontiers of China*, E. Herbert Norman's *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State*, Richard H. Tawney's *Land and Labour in China*, and Teng Ssu-yu and John King Fairbank's *China's Reponse to the West*—as well as many hundreds of lesser known titles were produced under its aegis.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps no other organ-

---

<sup>1</sup> The publication list includes some sixteen hundred books, monographs, pamphlets, and conference proceedings. See *IPR Publications on the Pacific: 1925-1952* (New York: Interna-

ization will ever match its contribution to the development of an academic field, and it is impossible to envision the current state of Asian and Pacific studies had it never existed.

In sum, the Institute was the source of the Asian and Pacific studies movement during this century, and, as John King Fairbank put it recently, it is necessary “to inform the current and coming generation of researchers as to who their great-grandfather was.”<sup>2</sup> The following article endeavors to outline the major features of that story in the hope that it will inspire more detailed explorations in the future.

The origins of the Institute date to 1919 when the American YMCA chose Honolulu as the site for a conference to explore the “fundamental and universal” elements of Christianity that contribute to “a common basis of understanding and motivation for the Pacific peoples.”<sup>3</sup> Little occurred until 1922 when Frank C. Atherton, an influential Honolulu business and civic leader who was also an active YMCA lay official, was asked to assume responsibility for the languishing project. Committed, resolute, and practical, Atherton was a good choice for the task and, as one of the major figures in this remarkably vital internationalist movement that had commenced in Hawaii at the turn of the century, he was also concerned about introducing the Pacific into the perspective of the then Eurocentric world. It is therefore not surprising that one of his first acts was to propose that the YMCA restructure the conference into a “round-table” discussion of a full range of Asian and Pacific issues involving prominent individuals from throughout the region. Participants should, he argued, employ a “Christian approach” but otherwise need not be associated with either Christianity or the YMCA.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps because of its long involvement in Asia and elsewhere in the non-Western world in conjunction with the then current wave of international organizing and conferencing, the YMCA accepted

---

tional Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953), post-1952 issues of *Pacific Affairs*, and related post-1952 IPR publication lists (former work hereafter cited as *Publications on the Pacific*). Full citations for the works referenced are J. Lossing Buck, *Land Utilization in China* (Shanghai: The Commercial Press, Ltd., 1937); George McT. Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952); Felix M. Keesing, *Modern Samoa: Its Government and Changing Life* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1934); Owen Lattimore, *Inner Asian Frontiers of China* (London: Oxford University Press, 1940); E. Herbert Norman, *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State: Political and Economic Problems of the Meiji Period* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940); Richard H. Tawney, *Land and Labour in China* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1932); and Teng Ssu-yu and John King Fairbank with E-tu Zen Sun, Chaoying Fang, *et al.*, *China's Response to the West: A Documentary Survey, 1839-1923* (New York: Atheneum, 1963).

<sup>2</sup> Fairbank to Holland, February 10, 1987. Personal papers of William L. Holland.

<sup>3</sup> *Institute of Pacific Relations: Honolulu Session, June 30-July 15, 1925* (Honolulu: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1925), p. 8 (hereafter cited as *Honolulu Session*).

<sup>4</sup> “Minutes of the General Calling Committee of the Pacific Conference, Haddon Hall, Atlantic City, N.J., U.S.A.,” 21 September 1924, University of Hawaii Archives, Institute of Pacific Relations collection, Pacific Council File.

## *Pacific Affairs*

Atherton's proposal and assigned J. Merle Davis of its national staff and Charles F. Loomis of its Honolulu staff to assist him.

Working together, Atherton, Davis, and Loomis concluded that still another change was in order if the pending gathering was to realize its full potential. They suggested that it be made the founding session of a permanent, independent, and international association of influential Pacific Basin citizens devoted to consultation and research directed at reducing some of the region's more pressing tensions. While only mildly imaginative by current standards, which acknowledge the necessity of Pacific research and accept the centrality of the region in world affairs, this suggestion was extraordinary by the standards of the 1920s and it aroused considerable excitement and support. An international planning committee was formed under the leadership of Stanford University president (and later United States Secretary of the Interior) Ray Lyman Wilbur which, aided by hastily organized subcommittees in Australia, Canada, China, Japan, and the United States, developed a proposal calling for the creation of a new organization to be called the Institute of Pacific Relations and structured in accordance with the following objectives and procedures:

The Institute of Pacific Relations is [to be] a body of men and women deeply interested in the Pacific area, who meet and work, not as representatives of their Governments, or of any other organizations, but as individuals in order to promote the well-being of the peoples concerned . . .

Its main efforts will be devoted to collecting and elucidating the facts of international significance, which, by their influence in guiding public opinion, may assist constructively, the development of the countries concerned; to urging the improvement of legal and administrative procedure where present methods tend to hinder international harmony and good feeling; and directly to promoting international friendship by personal association and by the study of economic, educational, social, political, moral and religious conditions with a view to their improvement.<sup>5</sup>

Although the Institute's founding assumptions may appear naive in light of subsequent developments, few found them so at the time. The enthusiasm that followed the original suggestion by Atherton and his colleagues continued to spread, and the YMCA responded by relinquishing control over the project so that it might proceed independently. Planning and fund-raising were accelerated, and when the long-awaited meeting was finally convened at Punahou School in Honolulu during the first two weeks of July, 1925 the main order of business for the 143 delegates and observers was the organization of the proposed Institute. There were 109 national delegates from Australia, Canada, China, Hawaii, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, and the United States; three at-large delegates; and thirty-one observers.<sup>6</sup> Following a series of hastily-prepared

---

<sup>5</sup> *Honolulu Session*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>6</sup> Although Hawaii was an American territory, Korea a Japanese colony, and the Philippines an American colony, their delegations were accorded national standing for the initial

## *The Institute of Pacific Relations*

round-table discussions, the delegates approved Wilbur's proposal and the Institute came into being. A central coordinating authority called the Pacific Council was formed and officers were elected (Wilbur as chairman, Atherton as vice-chairman, and L. Tenny Peck of Honolulu as treasurer). An appointed professional secretariat headed by Davis as general secretary and Loomis as assistant general secretary was established under the Pacific Council and quartered in Honolulu, and delegates were urged to create autonomous national councils within their respective countries upon their return. Finally, a decision was made to reconvene in Honolulu two years later for what would become the first in a long series of conferences devoted to contemporary Asian and Pacific issues.

Inspired by the enthusiasm of the delegates as well as considerable favorable press coverage, the Institute's leaders plunged into a fast-paced round of organizational activity in preparation for the 1927 gathering. Davis and Loomis spent most of the period traveling in Asia and North America assisting with the organization of national councils and, to a lesser extent, local chapters. In addition, they fashioned the Pacific Council into a more sophisticated assembly by adding an International Research Committee drawn from the new national councils to advise on research projects, and by increasing the number of professional staff members. This group assumed responsibility for coordinating policy formation, administrative activities, fund-raising, and issues research, although the stronger national councils and local chapters, many with their own professional staffs, operated in a similar but independent manner under the organization's federated institutional structure. The American Council, headed initially by Edward C. Carter, an imaginative and ambitious activist who likewise came from a YMCA background, was always the most notable example of national council activism, and Honolulu and San Francisco sponsored the most consistently involved local chapters.

A combination of sustained general enthusiasm and unflagging effort on the part of its leaders enabled the Institute to compile a truly remarkable record of achievement before it ran afoul of the McCarthyite movement and collapsed in the late 1950s. With respect to organization, six national councils (Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Zealand, and the United States) and at least eleven local chapters (Auckland, Christchurch, Honolulu, Manila, Melbourne, Montreal, Seoul, Sydney, Toronto, Vancouver, and Wellington) were formed and, to varying degrees, active by the time the Institute reconvened in Honolulu in 1927. Thereafter, additional national councils were established in Burma (briefly), France, Great Britain, India, the Netherlands (and subsequently Indonesia), Pakistan, the Philippines, and the Soviet Union (briefly) while new local chapters were organized in a

---

gathering. Thereafter, Hawaii was merged with the American Council and Korea was absorbed by the Japanese Council. The Philippines, however, retained their national standing.

number of other cities, particularly those on the Pacific coast of the United States.<sup>7</sup> The Institute's conference record is likewise impressive. Following the two initial gatherings in Honolulu, the group came together again for eleven major international conferences (Kyoto, Japan—1929; Shanghai-Hangchow, China—1931; Banff, Canada—1933; Yosemite, USA—1936; Virginia Beach, USA—1939; Mont Tremblant, Canada—1942; Hot Springs, USA—1945; Stratford, England—1947; Lucknow, India—1950; Kyoto, Japan—1954; and Lahore, Pakistan—1958) in addition to uncounted smaller gatherings. As noted earlier, the organization's record in research and publication is even more remarkable. Finally, and just as basic, little of this would have been possible had not the Institute proved equally adept at fund-raising. Until the troubles of the 1950s altered circumstances, its officers managed to assemble a yearly aggregate of foundation grants, corporate and individual donations, membership dues, and income from publication sales that was sufficient to fund the group's various activities.<sup>8</sup>

Of the Institute's many achievements, the accomplishments of its research program have proven most significant and enduring. Although some research was attempted prior to the initial conference, the program began in earnest with preparations for the 1927 conference.<sup>9</sup> Aware of the need for sophisticated background papers to facilitate serious discussion as current information on Asia and the Pacific was then limited, and aware also that the quality of the papers prepared for the initial gathering had been inadequate, Institute officials concluded that research must be made an integral part of the organization's program. A fund-raising effort was initiated and it proved immensely successful. A total of approximately \$115,000 was raised in 1926 and 1927, \$25,000 of which came from a Carnegie Endowment for International Peace grant dedicated largely for research, and another \$15,000 of which was provided by a Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial grant intended for the same purpose.<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that the latter award was the first in a series of Rockefeller Founda-

---

<sup>7</sup> For most of the Institute's history, the national councils in Australia, Canada, France, Great Britain, India, the Netherlands, Pakistan, and the Soviet Union were sub-divisions of more general national organizations (mostly called "Institutes of International Affairs"), essentially private in nature with the exception of the Soviet Union. The remaining councils were both independent and private although some (notably China and Japan) probably had informal governmental ties. See William L. Holland, "The IPR; A Historical Sketch." Unpublished manuscript, July 1980, pp. 7-11. Personal papers of W.L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Sketch").

<sup>8</sup> The origins of the Institute are discussed in detail in Paul F. Hooper, *Elusive Destiny: The Internationalist Movement in Modern Hawaii* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980), pp. 107-17 (hereafter cited as Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*). For an interesting personal account, see John B. Condliffe, *Reminiscences of the Institute of Pacific Relations* (Vancouver: Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia, 1981).

<sup>9</sup> *Reports of the International Secretariat and the International Finance Committee: Volume I*. Unpublished report; January 1946, p. 35. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as *Reports*).

<sup>10</sup> Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, pp. 116-17.

## *The Institute of Pacific Relations*

tion grants which were provided regularly until 1950 and which constituted approximately half of the Institute's total grant income. It should also be noted that most of the remainder of its funding during this period came from still other foundation grants and corporate contributions.<sup>11</sup>

Using these funds, Institute officials created a research unit as still another part of the Pacific Council. As noted, an International Research Committee was formed to offer general guidance (chaired at various times by such notables as James T. Shotwell, Carl L. Alsberg, and Sir George Sansom), and a research secretary position was funded to provide both direct administration of the projects sponsored by the central headquarters and assistance with those occurring under national council and local chapter auspices. John B. Condliffe, an established academic economist from Canterbury University in New Zealand, was selected for the new position, and he immediately accelerated the pace of activity. By the end of the year, publication of the *Institute News Bulletin*, the organization's first periodical and forerunner of its widely-respected *Pacific Affairs*, was under way. In addition, fifty-seven titles were published under varying degrees of Institute sponsorship whereas only two (aside from conference proceedings) had appeared during the 1925-26 period. While most were brief pamphlets or outlines, a few, such as Roderick D. McKenzie's *Oriental Exclusion* and Eliot G. Mears' *Resident Orientals on the American Pacific Coast*, were substantial.<sup>12</sup> Finally, considerably more sophisticated background materials were prepared for the 1927 conference. In all, it was an auspicious beginning that foretold something of what would follow.

Much of the inspiration behind the Institute's decision to expand its research effort came from the realization, clear to most at the conclusion of the 1925 conference, that surface tensions in the Pacific were but superficial manifestations of more basic conflicts about which little information was readily available. Japan's covetous view of Manchuria, to cite a major concern of the Institute during its early years, had to be understood in terms of such underlying issues as population growth, the industrialization process, and existing trade practices as well as simply the urge to build an

---

<sup>11</sup> William L. Holland, *Truth and Fancy about the Institute of Pacific Relations* (New York: American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953), p. 6. This is not to suggest as some have (for example, see Jonathan Marshall, "IPR was Big Business," *Pacific Research and World Empire Telegram* VI, no. 4 [May-June, 1975], pp. 1-13) that the Institute was under the control of large corporate interests.

<sup>12</sup> Frederick V. Field, *A Research Program in the Pacific Area* (Honolulu: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1933), pp. 13-35. The total is from work sponsored by all national councils and local chapters as well as the Pacific Council and involves studies given tangential as well as full support. Nonetheless, it represents an impressive beginning. Full citations for the works referenced are Roderick D. McKenzie, *Oriental Exclusion: The Effect of American Immigration Laws, Regulations, and Judicial Decisions Upon the Chinese and Japanese on the American Pacific Coast* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928) and Eliot G. Mears, *Resident Orientals on the American Pacific Coast: Their Legal and Economic Status* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928).

empire in emulation of the Western imperial powers. Hence, Institute leaders recognized early on that systematic basic research, time-consuming and expensive as it might be, was essential.

The response of Condliffe and his colleagues to this realization was, in hindsight, central to the Institute's subsequent record of research achievement. Aware that any effort to build an internal research staff capable of properly exploring the massive array of issues underlying the various problems of the region would likely prove futile given the organization's limited resources, they identified the more pressing topics. Once this was done they persuaded scholars, both established and aspiring, to undertake studies in return for research stipends, short-term appointments with the Institute, publication subsidies, and, on occasion, major grants arranged through such organizations as the Social Science Research Council. While a certain amount of research was conducted by the professional staff, most was performed by outsiders supported by one or another of these varied types of assistance. The results of this collaborative approach, replicated as far as possible by the national councils and even some local chapters, are noteworthy. Individual scholars gained new opportunities to conduct research and publish it, institutional research programs at numerous universities and certain private organizations (the Brookings Institution is a prominent example) were strengthened, and the world gained access to an array of scholarship that otherwise would have been unavailable. In the process, the Institute, despite its limited size and financial base, established itself as a major factor in Asian and Pacific scholarship.<sup>13</sup>

By the mid-1930s, the Institute had identified ten major categories of issues which it felt were in greatest need of serious study and established research projects within each, frequently in the form of comparative national or regional studies involving the cooperative efforts of a network of individuals and institutions.<sup>14</sup> The first and most ambitious of these projects was focused upon demography, land utilization, and food supply in China, Japan, and, to a lesser extent, Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Persuaded that the inter-relationship of these factors explained much of the tension in East Asia, the Institute sought to collect the then largely non-existent quantitative data necessary to illustrate the connections—population density and distribution, extent of arable land, climatic factors, production and distribution techniques, standards of living, and related considerations.

---

<sup>13</sup> "The Study of International Affairs in the Pacific Area," *IPR Notes*, no. 5 (June, 1936), pp. 1-54.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-31. The ten projects were entitled (1) Food Supply, Population and Land Utilization; (2) Industrial Development in the Far East; (3) Rural Economic and Social Changes in the Far East; (4) Tariffs, Raw Materials, Foreign Trade and Investments; (5) Economic and Political Development in Manchuria; (6) Dependencies, Native Peoples and Colonial Development; (7) Social and Cultural Relations; (8) Migration and Immigration Restriction; (9) Standards of Living; and (10) International Law, Diplomatic Machinery and Political Developments.

An impressive array of scholarly organizations and individuals was involved, especially in China and Japan where, because of the Manchurian issue, efforts were concentrated. In the Chinese case, J. Lossing Buck was provided extensive support (nearly \$70,000 over the 1928-35 period) for research that led to the publication in 1937 of his previously cited study on Chinese land utilization. This work was prepared in close cooperation with scholars at several Chinese universities—in particular the University of Nanjing—and thus had the concomitant effect of helping the schools develop their own research capabilities. Complementing Buck's work, arrangements were made with the Social Science Research Council to support a study of the consumption of agricultural products in East Asia by Stanford University's Food Research Institute and an analysis of Japan's international economic position by the Brookings Institution. Other related studies by individual scholars and scholarly institutions in both China and the West were also underwritten. In all, perhaps a hundred individuals representing at least ten different institutions worked on this project at one time or another, and they produced some twelve directly related studies, most of which broke new ground in the quantitative description of Chinese circumstances.

A similar although less exhaustive process was followed in the Japanese case. Led by Shiroshi Nasu and staffed largely by graduate agricultural students from the Tokyo Imperial University, this project resulted in the publication of seven studies on various aspects of land utilization in Japan. Related undertakings elsewhere in Asia led to works on population, immigration, agricultural techniques, and economic conditions in Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Although more attention was devoted to China than the other nations of the region, existing data on the others (save perhaps those of Southeast Asia which were not part of the undertaking) were more complete, and the end result was something approaching a balance in available information and, equally important, the ability to compile it. Given the times, this was an accomplishment of major proportions.

Activity in the Institute's nine remaining areas of research followed a similar, if sometimes less intensive, pattern. A project on the status of East Asian industrial development produced a number of pioneering monographs on aspects of early twentieth century Chinese industrialism (and helped Nankai University, whose faculty performed much of the related work, develop a lasting reputation as a center of economic research), a series of studies on Japanese export industries, and still other analyses of the impact of Asian industry on the West. A related project concerning rural economies in East Asia produced Richard H. Tawney's previously cited study of land and labor in China and introduced the work of German Sinologist Karl A. Wittfogel to the English-speaking academic community. Another related project dealing with raw materials, investments, trade,



and tariffs resulted in the publication of some twenty reports, monographs, and full-length studies ranging from such country-specific works as Eliot G. Mear's *Maritime Trade of the Western United States* to region-wide analyses like *Commodity Control in the Pacific Area* which William L. Holland edited.<sup>15</sup> Project participants varied from individuals working under the sponsorship of national councils to teams under the direction of academic institutions, and they addressed activities in virtually all the Pacific nations as well as those European nations with Pacific interests. Three similar projects involving regional migration and immigration, living standards, and international law and diplomacy also resulted in useful studies—particularly with respect to overseas communities—but changed circumstances have since dated most of them.

Two other projects, both with more distinct political overtones, were focused upon the Manchurian issue and the broader question of colonialism and dependencies. Among other things, the former undertaking was responsible for the first of Owen Lattimore's invaluable studies on China's border relations as well as some pointed statements of differing Chinese and Japanese views on the issue which, if nothing else, highlighted the difficulty of finding a peaceful solution. The latter effort resulted in the publication of various studies on European colonial administration in Southeast Asia and some of the first serious examinations of American and Japanese colonial practices in the Philippines and the Pacific islands. Of these, Felix M. Keesing's previously cited *Modern Samoa*, Linden Mander's *Some Dependent Peoples of the South Pacific*, and Tadao Yanaihara's *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate* are perhaps best remembered.<sup>16</sup>

The most general of the Institute's ten initial projects was usually described simply as "social and cultural relations." A catch-all category for research on topics ranging from family structure to cross-cultural influences, this project was more historical in nature and thus less subject to dating by changing current events than those concerned with more contemporary topics. It is therefore no coincidence that many of the Institute-sponsored works still appearing on contemporary readings lists—for example, Ch'ao-ting Chi's *Key Economic Areas in Chinese History*, Sophia H. Chen Zen's *Symposium on Chinese Culture*, and some of Owen Lattimore's earlier work on Chinese border issues—emerged from this project.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Eliot G. Mears, *Maritime Trade of the United States* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935) and William L. Holland (ed.), *Commodity Control in the Pacific Area* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1935).

<sup>16</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Linden Mander, *Some Dependent Peoples of the South Pacific* (New York: Macmillan, 1954) and Tadao Yanaihara, *Pacific Islands Under Japanese Mandate* (London: Oxford University Press, 1940).

<sup>17</sup> For greater detail on these projects see footnote 14. Also see the proceedings of the various conferences held during the period. Full citations for the works referenced are Ch'ao-ung Chi,

While most of the early research carrying the Institute's imprimatur was closely related to one or another of the central organization's ten major projects, a certain amount was sponsored solely by national councils and local chapters. The first publication of the Chinese Council, for example, was an English translation of Sun Yat-sen's *Three Principles of the People*.<sup>18</sup> The British Council, an affiliate of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, worked through its parent organization to produce such publications as Sir Frederick Whyte's *China and Foreign Powers*.<sup>19</sup> The Soviet Council, active in an independent fashion for a brief period during the mid-1930s, issued a series of monographs for the 1936 Yosemite conference concerning Soviet resources and economic development. The Australian, Canadian, and New Zealand Councils, while active participants in the central program, were prone to inward-looking research, and titles such as *The Peopling of Australia, Canada Today, and Agricultural Organization in New Zealand* dot their annals. Still other examples can be found in the records of the various national councils as well as those local chapters well enough organized and funded to support research activity. The Hawaii chapter, a group that always considered itself as more than simply another local chapter by virtue of its role in the organization's founding, provides the best example of locally sponsored work. Active until shortly before the central organization's demise, it contributed to various central projects, initiated a high school textbook program which resulted in the publication of texts on China, Hawaii, and Japan, supported some of Romano Adams' and Andrew Lind's pioneering studies on Hawaiian race relations, and prepared working papers for numerous conferences which it hosted over the years.<sup>20</sup>

As a complement to its research program, the Institute developed a noteworthy series of periodicals. In 1928, the *Institute News Bulletin* was replaced by *Pacific Affairs*, a combination monthly newsletter and semi-scholarly journal under the editorial direction of Elizabeth Greene. In 1933, she was replaced by Owen Lattimore who edited the publication from 1933 to 1941 and transformed it into a lively and frequently controversial academic quarterly which gained quick acceptance among those with scholarly interests in Asia and the Pacific. Thereafter, it remained the Institute's

---

*Key Economic Areas in Chinese History: As Revealed in the Development of Public Works for Water Control* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1936) and Sophia H. Chen Zen (ed.), *Symposium on Chinese Culture* (Shanghai: Chinese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1931).

<sup>18</sup> Full citation for the work referenced is Sun Yat-sen, *San Min Chu I: The Three Principles of the People*, trans. Frank W. Price (Shanghai: Chinese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1927).

<sup>19</sup> Full citation for the work referenced is Sir Frederick Whyte, *China and Foreign Powers: An Historical Review of their Relations* (2nd ed. rev.; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1928).

<sup>20</sup> Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, pp. 125-29.

most visible periodical. The *Far Eastern Survey* (now *Asian Survey*), another scholarly periodical with an economic focus, was initiated under the sponsorship of the American Council in 1932 and it likewise grew in size and respectability. A number of other periodicals, mostly newsletters such as the *IPR Notes* which reported on the organization's general activities, appeared sporadically during this period and the years following. In addition, most of the national councils at one time or another published their own journals and newsletters, but only those co-sponsored by a parent organization survived for a substantial period. The Royal Institute of International Affairs' *International Affairs* (British Council), the Centre d'Etudes de Politique Etrangère's *Politique Etrangère* (French Council), and the Soviet Union's *Pacific Ocean* (Soviet Council) are examples. As a measure of the Institute's record in research and publication during its first decade, a bibliography published in 1936 lists approximately 140 books and pamphlets either published or scheduled for publication under some form of organizational sponsorship. Conference papers, proceedings, and periodicals are not included in the total.<sup>21</sup>

Despite its remarkable record of achievement—or perhaps because of it—the Institute's history during its formative years was also marked by dissension. Most disagreement centered on the question, basic to virtually every aspect of the organization's program, of whether the group should be maintained in its original mode as a relatively low-profile discussion forum primarily concerned with long-term cultural and economic problems or be transformed into a more aggressive association of foreign policy scholars and public affairs lobbyists with a particular interest in current political issues. A closely related question concerned the desirability of maintaining the organization's headquarters in Honolulu or relocating them to a major metropolitan center such as New York. In the main, this dispute was an American affair with the organization's Hawaiian founders and Pacific coast chapter members generally favoring the *status quo* while easterners associated with the American Council were largely in favor of changes. Atherton was the acknowledged leader of the former group while Carter dominated the latter.

The first significant indication of this struggle surfaced during the Institute's third conference at Kyoto in 1929. In a major address to the delegates, Davis announced that he was resigning as general secretary because he feared the proposed changes, which he apparently believed were inevitable, would destroy the open character of the organization and reduce its participants to little more than mouthpieces for their respective governments. Despite the pointedness of this warning and the fact that maneuvering over the Manchurian issue by the Chinese and Japanese delegations at the conference seemed to validate it, the debate was not

---

<sup>21</sup> "Publications on the Pacific," *IPR Notes — Part Two*, no. 5 (June, 1936), pp. 1-36.

quelled. Davis' resignation was accepted, and Loomis was selected to serve as acting general secretary until the matter was resolved and agreement upon a permanent replacement was possible.

Although the differences between the two groups may appear minor in hindsight, they loomed as ominous portents to the participants, and emotions ran high. Carter's people, on the offensive from the outset, employed a consistently heavy-handed approach both during and after the conference. They charged, in blunt terms, that Hawaii, far from being an inspirational model for people of different socio-cultural backgrounds as the Hawaiian leaders believed, was a provincial backwash and therefore unsuitable as a headquarters site. As Carter once put it, "Honolulu has no culture; no facilities for world news; and is so tropical that no one can think of do[ing] serious work."<sup>22</sup> Some went so far as to call Hawaii a "fair-land."<sup>23</sup> Others like Lattimore joined the debate in a more refined fashion, arguing that Pacific problems were in fact world problems and should not be viewed solely from Pacific perspectives, but even his remarks did not always avoid sarcasm and invective. Atherton and his group countered, first by describing many kinds of serious research work that various other Island institutions had conducted over the preceding years and suggesting that an overly active approach would ruin the organization. When these arguments failed to still criticism, they adopted the intemperate tactics of their opponents. Sneering references to the "young professionals" of the American Council and similar remarks began to appear with regularity.<sup>24</sup>

Serious issues of lasting consequence were at stake in this debate despite its frequently sensational and sometimes even childish overtones. The most important of these was reflected in Lattimore's reference to the global dimensions of Pacific problems. Atherton and his group were inclined to view Pacific issues in localized and somewhat technical terms which led to the belief that all such issues were subject to negotiated settlement on a case-to-case basis so long as sufficient data were available. To Carter and his group, who tended to see the same issues in broader geo-political terms, Atherton's perspective seemed both narrow and naive. They believed that mere data, no matter how complete, rarely produce a solution as most problems involve value choices beyond the pale of solely objective information and that such solutions can rarely be considered meaningful until they are accepted by political decision-makers. Hence, they felt the Institute could be effective only if it engaged a wide range of issues, conducted research calculated to show the full complexity of those issues, drew whatever conclusions the research warranted, and supported those conclusions within the political arena. They could not, therefore, accept any version of the charge that their approach over-emphasized research and activism.

---

<sup>22</sup> Hooper, *Elusive Destiny*, p. 121.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

However, while this dispute continued to draw attention for the better part of a decade, the basic issue was resolved by the mid-1930s when American Council activists, capitalizing upon a steady expansion of their influence, took full control of the organization. In 1933, Carter was named general secretary (retitling the position to secretary general), and in 1934 the headquarters were moved to New York. Although disappointed, the Hawaii group took its defeat gracefully and continued an active participation—with particular respect to research as noted—until the early 1950s.<sup>25</sup>

It was inevitable that this debate would also affect the Institute's research and publication program. In fact, some of the more basic issues were actually outgrowths of ideas that originated in the research program. For example, Condliffe's decision to emphasize basic research led him to conclude that the program should be headquartered nearer to the major centers of scholarly activity. Accordingly, in 1930, just as similar thoughts were starting to come before the Pacific Council, the research program was moved from Honolulu to Ann Arbor and, following several subsequent interim moves, established more or less permanently in New York. This greatly upset Atherton and his followers but the decision held. Lattimore acted similarly following his appointment as editor of *Pacific Affairs* in 1933. He relocated the journal's offices to New York where, as noted, he scrapped its casual format and transformed it into what would become a widely-known and respected, if controversial, academic publication. Once again there were objections to the change but no reversal. The end result was thus a preview of the changes in store for the entire Institute. It should be noted, however, that Condliffe was involved only during the initial stages. He resigned late in 1932 to accept a position with the League of Nations and was replaced by William L. Holland, his principal aide, who oversaw most of the actual changes.<sup>26</sup>

Although they had no way of knowing it at the time, when the Institute's leaders selected Holland they were choosing a man who would serve not only as Condliffe's replacement but also as Carter's successor and would come to be generally recognized as the organization's most faithful and valued official. A native of New Zealand who earned his B.A. and M.A. degrees in economics under Condliffe's tutelage at Canterbury University during the late 1920s, he joined the Institute in early 1929 as research aide to assist with preparations for the pending Kyoto conference. When this task was finished late in the same year, Condliffe sent him to China to assist Richard H. Tawney with the research that led to the latter's publication of his previously cited work on land and labor. After two years in China (which included contacts with the most Institute-related scholars in East Asia, extensive travel, and assistance with the 1931 Shanghai-Hangchow confer-

---

<sup>25</sup> See *Ibid.*, pp. 117–25 for details of the dispute.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

ence, in addition to the work with Tawney) and a year of advanced study at Cambridge, he returned to the Institute in 1933 to fill the vacancy left by Condliffe's resignation.<sup>27</sup> In this position, he developed a reputation as both a skilled administrator with a remarkable ability to draw others into the organization's activities and an able scholar in his own right.<sup>28</sup>

Although the research program had been substantially altered as part of the Institute's general reorientation, the changes were not obvious during the first few years of Holland's tenure. The earlier focus upon the ten major areas of activity continued, as did the underlying goal of producing comparative research designed to both provide basic data and heighten awareness of Pacific issues throughout the Eurocentric western world. A growing number of the studies initiated during the Condliffe era were concluded, the organization's publication list expanded steadily, and more names that eventually would be well-known in academic circles—among them Hu Shih, Olga Lang, and Lin Yutang—made their initial appearance, but nothing in the way of fundamental redirection was evident.<sup>29</sup>

Illustrative of this seeming tranquility, in the spring of 1934 Holland temporarily relocated the research headquarters to Tokyo in order to be in closer touch with the organization's major on-going projects which had been focused largely on China and Japan since their inception. Virtually all his efforts during these years were in some fashion related to these projects. His major administrative task during this period, for example, was the convening of a conference early in 1935 to review progress on the "standards of living" project, one of the ten original undertakings.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, much of his personal time during the same period was devoted to revising and completing Philip G. Wright's manuscript on Pacific trade (unfinished at the time of the latter's death) and editing a series of papers on commodity controls which had been delivered at the Banff conference in 1933. Both undertakings, which were subsequently published as *Trade and Trade Barriers in the Pacific* and the previously cited *Commodity Control in the Pacific Area* respectively, were likewise outgrowths of the initial

---

<sup>27</sup> William L. Holland, "IPR Memoirs: 1930-1933." Unpublished manuscript, n.d., pp. 1-4. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Memoirs: 1930-33"). Also see Holland, "Sketch," pp. 1-17.

<sup>28</sup> See John King Fairbank, "William L. Holland and the IPR in Historical Perspective," *Pacific Affairs* 52, no. 4 (Winter 1979-80), p. 588 for greater elaboration.

<sup>29</sup> There were certain new initiatives during this period that were at least tangentially connected with research. Of particular note is an effort to expand public awareness of Asia that centered on the development of textbooks, films, survey pamphlets, informational press releases, Asian language courses, and Asian library collections. For details, see William L. Holland, "Some Recollections of the American IPR: Parts 1 and 2." Unpublished manuscript, May, 1984, p. 12. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Recollections: Parts 1 and 2"). Also see the various annual reports of the American Council during this period.

<sup>30</sup> For greater detail, see *Interim Research Conference: Tokyo, April 16-24, 1935*. Unpublished report, n.d. Personal papers of William L. Holland.

projects.<sup>31</sup> Still another practice from the earlier era which Holland carried over was the retention of promising younger people as research aides as a means of helping them launch scholarly careers. Among those who worked with him in this capacity in Tokyo was Barbara Tuchman who was to become a widely-known historian.<sup>32</sup> Her case also serves as a reminder that women played significant roles in the Institute from the outset, a noteworthy fact, given contemporary attitudes.

The serenity of this period was shortlived, however. In April 1935, the Japanese government, increasingly unsettled by a steady flow of Institute studies and statements critical of its Manchurian policy dating from at least the Shanghai-Hangchow conference in 1931, pressured the Japanese Council into requesting the closure of the Tokyo research office. Holland complied and returned the office to New York, but the move did little to resolve the underlying tensions. With Japan's invasion of China proper in 1937, Institute criticism mounted and the Japanese Council became increasingly isolated within the organization. Six years later it was formally dissolved by the wartime government.<sup>33</sup>

As Carter and his supporters had anticipated, the Institute was emerging as a factor in world affairs and would remain so until the time of its collapse. From the vantage point of hindsight, however, it is evident that this achievement came at a price. As the organization grew in stature and influence, external events increasingly determined its priorities, and it would never again be in complete control of its agenda. From this point onward, the course of history—first in the Pacific with the Sino-Japanese war, then in the world at large with the Second World War, and finally in the United States with the McCarthyite movement—would exercise a growing role in shaping its focus and effort.

With respect to research, the first major illustration of the developing tie between events at large and the organization's program came in 1937 when it made a preliminary decision to launch an "informal inquiry" into the root causes of the Sino-Japanese war.<sup>34</sup> Although earlier projects were continued and related studies regularly published, by 1938 the informal project had evolved into a formal program, organized in much the same fashion as previous research projects but with separate status, funded by a

---

<sup>31</sup> William L. Holland, "An Outline of the IPR International Research Program: 1936-1949." Unpublished manuscript, October 1984, pp. 2-3. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Research Program"). Full citation for the work referenced is Philip G. Wright, *Trade and Trade Barriers in the Pacific* (Honolulu: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1935).

<sup>32</sup> Holland, "Recollections: Parts 1 and 2," p. 6.

<sup>33</sup> William L. Holland, "IPR Memoirs: 1934-1937." Unpublished manuscript, n.d. p. 2. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Memoirs: 1934-37").

<sup>34</sup> *Annual Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations: 1938* (New York: American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1938), p. 26 (hereafter cited as *ACIPR Annual Report: 1938*).

special grant from the Rockefeller Foundation and entitled the "Inquiry Series." In addition, its original purpose had been broadened to include an examination of the effect of this conflict upon western nations with Asian interests and an exploration of the issues pertinent to a post-war settlement.<sup>35</sup> Never before had the Institute focused its research so specifically upon a particular current event.

For the next several years, this undertaking dominated the attention of the Pacific Council and the various national councils. Even the Japanese Council, now operating essentially independently, was involved in the sense that it initiated a series of its own designed to forward Japan's view of the conflict.<sup>36</sup> When the Virginia Beach conference convened in 1939, some twenty pamphlets on related political and economic issues had been prepared, and shortly thereafter an impressive array of works began to appear. Among the better-known titles from the initial phase of the project were Thomas A. Bisson's *America's Far Eastern Policy*, Hugh Borton's *Japan Since 1931*, E. Herbert Norman's previously cited *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State*, Nathaniel Peffer's *Basis for Peace in the Far East*, and George E. Taylor's *The Struggle for North China*.<sup>37</sup> However, focused upon war-related issues as the Institute became during these years, it is worth noting that it still failed to persuade even its own membership that a general Pacific war was coming. As Holland recalls, the American Council co-sponsored a seminar in Cleveland over the weekend of December 6-7, 1941 where a number of authorities predicted there would be no wider war in the region because Japan lacked the industrial strength to sustain one. When Carter interrupted the proceedings shortly after lunch on Sunday to announce the news of the attack on Pearl Harbor, literally no one in the group took him seriously. They were convinced only after he brought a radio into the room and let them hear the reports firsthand.<sup>38</sup>

As time passed and the initial topics were addressed, the focus of the Inquiry Series was once again broadened, this time to include issues pertinent to Southeast Asia. As before, the end result was characterized by a goodly number of works that would become widely used. Among the more

---

<sup>35</sup> *Annual Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations: 1939-1940* (New York: American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940), pp. 12 and 40 (hereafter cited as *ACIPR Annual Report: 1939-40*). Also see Holland, "Research Program," p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> Holland, "Research Program," pp. 4-5.

<sup>37</sup> *ACIPR Annual Report: 1939-40*, p. 13. Full citations for the works referenced are Thomas A. Bisson, *America's Far Eastern Policy* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1945); Hugh Borton, *Japan Since 1931: Its Political and Social Developments* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940); Nathaniel Peffer, *Basis for Peace in the Far East* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942); and George E. Taylor, *The Struggle for North China* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940).

<sup>38</sup> William L. Holland, "IPR Memoirs: 1939-1946." Unpublished manuscript, n.d., pp. 2-3. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Memoirs: 1939-46").



prominent in this regard are Jan O.M. Broek's *Economic Development of the Netherland Indies*, Rupert Emerson, Lennox A. Mills and Virginia Thompson's *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia*, and John S. Furnivall's *Educational Progress in Southeast Asia*.<sup>39</sup> Just as other Institute-sponsored research was basic to the emergence of Asian studies, these and related works (sponsored by the Institute but not part of the Inquiry Series) proved essential in the eventual establishment of Southeast Asian studies as a distinct sub-division within the broader field. With the exception of a small number of studies on colonial policies within the region, usually by scholars from the colonial powers, the area simply received no significant attention prior to the war. In fact, it was not even known by the general term "Southeast Asia."<sup>40</sup> All this changed during the course of the war, and the Institute deserves a major share of the credit.

In all, the Inquiry Series resulted in the publication of some thirty scholarly works, many of them substantial. It also accelerated the process by which events of the times increasingly took control of the Institute's agenda. Although the organization undertook the project with the idea of merely elucidating the issues underlying the war in Asia, it soon found it difficult to maintain a scholarly distance from the subject. Within months of the outbreak of general war, the entire organization, including its research branches, was caught up in the Allied cause and thereafter began looking forward to an active role in reshaping the Pacific following Japan's defeat. As the following statement by Ray Lyman Wilbur of the American Council illustrates, there was suddenly no longer any room for scholarly neutrality:

The officers and staff of the Council . . . believe that the war situation, far from negating the purpose of the Council, lends new and crucial importance to its program of study and widespread discussion of the issues at stake; that such activities, in fact, form a vital part of a democratic war effort.

The immediate job of the American people is the prosecution of war against the military imperialism of Japan and the other Axis powers whose defeat is the condition of any peaceful adjustment in the Far East and elsewhere. The tradition of the IPR does not permit "neutrality" in this issue; on the contrary, military aggression, in complete disregard of the rights of other peoples, contradicts everything the IPR has stood for.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Jan O.M. Broek, *Economic Development of the Netherland Indies* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1942); Rupert Emerson, Lennox A. Mills, and Virginia Thompson, *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1942); and John S. Furnivall, *Educational Progress in Southeast Asia* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943).

<sup>40</sup> Holland, "Research Program," pp. 5-6. Also see *Publications on the Pacific*, pp. 101-2.

<sup>41</sup> *IPR in Wartime: Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations: 1944-1943* (New York: American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943), p. 8 (hereafter cited as *IPR in Wartime*).

Underlining this statement, the Pacific Council and the American Council jointly opened a Washington office in 1942 to facilitate closer contacts with Allied governmental representatives and, concurrently, attract more governmental interest in their various programs.<sup>42</sup>

While the Inquiry Series was the Institute's major undertaking during the war years, it was by no means its exclusive focus. In general, the organization made every effort to maintain its traditional schedule of activities. The conferences continued with meetings at Mont Tremblant in 1942 and Hot Springs in 1945, and publications generated by the regular research program continued to appear throughout the war. Owen Latimore's previously cited *Inner Asian Frontiers of China* and Carey McWilliam's *Prejudice* are well-known examples.<sup>43</sup> However, there is no denying that war-related activities were at center stage. Widespread ignorance about Asia led to a demand for information (especially on the part of the American military), and much of it came to be directed at the Institute as it was one of very few informed sources. In response, the organization developed a series of popular pamphlets on Asian background issues and Allied war aims as supplements to its more detailed Inquiry Series. In all, twenty-seven different pamphlets were written, reproduced in the thousands (five hundred thousand annually by 1945) and sold at or near cost.<sup>44</sup> In addition, staff members from all branches of the Institute made themselves available as lecturers, and most became engaged in a hectic schedule of appearances before government bodies, private organizations, and, interestingly, officer training programs.<sup>45</sup> The training programs, part of a concerted effort by the military to provide its officer candidates with a quick but comprehensive overview of Asia, would prove of considerable future significance as they provided at least some of the inspiration for the Asian studies programs that developed in the academic world in the years following the war.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the Institute's involvement in war-related activities is the number of its staff members who assumed actual positions with other groups directly concerned with the war. In some instances, they divided their time between their new responsibilities and their on-going Institute duties, but in most instances they left the organization and took full-time positions elsewhere. Illustrative of the extent of this involvement, the American Council 1944-46 biennial report lists nearly two pages of such staff changes, and other councils and local

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>43</sup> See *Publications on the Pacific*. Full citation for the work referenced is Carey McWilliams, *Prejudice: Japanese-Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1944).

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103-4. Also see *IPR in Wartime*, p. 27, and *IPR Bulletin* II, no. 1 (April 1946), p. 6.

<sup>45</sup> *Windows on the Pacific: Biennial Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations: 1944-1946* (New York: American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1946), pp. 9-10 (hereafter cited as *Windows on the Pacific*).

chapters were similarly affected. All, however, did endeavor to maintain at least a vestige of their regular programming.<sup>46</sup>

Carter is the most prominent example of those who divided their time between the Institute and other organizations. He retained his position with the Institute throughout the war but spent most of his time travelling, consulting, and fund-raising on behalf of Chinese and Soviet war relief agencies. He regularly combined the business of his various clients while travelling and yet somehow managed to please them all. A trip to China and the Soviet Union during the summer of 1943 demonstrates how he operated in this multifaceted role. Accompanied in this instance by Holland, he arranged for military air transport through Sumner Welles of the State Department, one of his many influential friends. Following a trip reminiscent of a passage from an espionage novel, he and Holland arrived in China where they juggled Chinese Council and war relief meetings as if they were one. The end result was the publication of various materials prepared by Chinese Council researchers (including a paper by Francis Hsu who later became well-known in Chinese and American academic circles) and certain war relief decisions of some consequence. The meetings concluded, Holland returned to the United States to continue his research duties, but Carter traveled on to Moscow for still more war relief meetings, this time with Foreign Minister Maksim Litvinov and other ranking Soviet officials.<sup>47</sup>

Those who left the Institute to assume full-time responsibilities with other war-related organizations were even more directly and, in some instances, more pointedly involved. Far and away the best known example in this regard is Owen Lattimore who, at the request of President Roosevelt, resigned as editor of *Pacific Affairs* in 1941 to become a special adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. While his contributions as an advisor were substantial, his role in the position became far better known during the McCarthy period when he was irresponsibly accused of using it to undermine the Nationalist government and prepare the way for the Communist revolution.<sup>48</sup> However, many other Institute officials also left their positions to

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11. Also see *IPR Secretariat Bulletin* I, no. 1 (April 1944), pp. 1-9.

<sup>47</sup> Holland, "Memoirs: 1939-46," pp. 6-9 and William L. Holland, "India-China Trip: 1943" (May, 1983), pp. 4-8. Personal papers of William L. Holland. There is an important aside to the story of this trip. During the stay in China, Carter antagonized Alfred Kohlberg, a representative of another war relief organization, with expressions of scepticism about certain wartime relief projects proposed by Chiang Kai-shek's government. Unimportant at the time, the incident later become significant as Kohlberg, apparently deeply disturbed by Carter's remarks, initiated the pro-Communist charges against the Institute that led to its troubles during the McCarthy era and its eventual collapse.

<sup>48</sup> For greater detail, see John N. Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974), pp. 67-73 (hereafter cited as Thomas, *The IPR*). It should be noted that this study, while limited essentially to the McCarthyite attack upon the Institute, is an extremely valuable basic source for a proper understanding of the organization. Also essential in this regard is William L. Holland, "Source Materials on the Institute of Pacific Relations," *Pacific Affairs* 58, no. 1 (Spring 1985), pp. 91-97.

assume war-related posts during this period so Lattimore, while better known than the others, was not unique. Holland himself was one of them, taking partial and then full leave for nearly two years between early 1944 and early 1946. Initially he worked in Washington with the Office of Strategic Services (predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency) but soon transferred to the Office of War Information (predecessor of the United States Information Agency) where he headed its Chungking office between February and September of 1945.<sup>49</sup> Among the fortuitous acquaintances he made during his tenure there were John King Fairbank, then an American embassy official, and journalist Theodore White, men who would help the Institute in later years when it came under ideological attack.<sup>50</sup> Hence, although the war came to control most of the Institute's time and agenda, it also strengthened the organization by centering positive attention upon it, expanding the network of influential acquaintances within and around it, and providing the opportunity for its research and perspective to reach what by pre-war standards was an unimaginably large audience.

Shortly after the war when Carter, faced with severe criticism from the European councils for his outspoken opposition to colonialism, resigned as secretary general, Holland was offered the position. He assumed the office (while also remaining research secretary) in March 1946 and held it until the organization was dissolved a decade and a half later. It is not surprising that he chose to accept the offer, for at the time virtually all concerned foresaw a bright future for the group despite the fact that the war had made a shambles of most of its Asian and European councils and left only the American Council as a force. With America as the pre-eminent post-war power, with key members of the American foreign policy establishment friendly toward its aims and leaders, and with a cross-section of America's best known figures willing to support it (in 1946, for example, the American Council was able to attract such prominent individuals as Pearl Buck, Lauchlin Currie, John Hersey, Paul Hoffman, Henry Luce, Juan Trippe, Henry Wallace, and Sumner Welles to its Board of Trustees<sup>51</sup>), Institute leaders were justified in thinking that their long-held vision of a new Pacific order might well be on the verge of realization.<sup>52</sup> That there might also be darker possibilities amidst the promises was not, understandably, a matter of much discussion at the time.

Buoyed by such optimism, the Institute's leaders opened the post-war era with a concerted effort to revive the organization's traditional mode of operations, and it appeared to be largely successful. With encouragement, supplies, and visits, Holland was able to help reactivate most of the

---

<sup>49</sup> William L. Holland, "In China 1943-1945." Unpublished manuscript, n.d., pp. 4-5. Personal papers of William L. Holland.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

<sup>51</sup> *Windows on the Pacific*, pp. 3-5.

<sup>52</sup> *Reports*, p. 1.

national councils disrupted by the war. He also kept the conferences on schedule with meetings at Stratford in 1947, Lucknow in 1950, Kyoto in 1954, and Lahore in 1958.<sup>53</sup> The same is true of the research program. A few works still in progress as a result of the pre-war projects were completed and published (two prominent examples are Chiang Monlin's *Tides from the West* and Karl A. Wittfogel and Feng Chia-sheng's *History of Chinese Society*<sup>54</sup>) and a host of new endeavors were initiated. Particular attention was paid to Southeast Asian studies where the Inquiry Series had opened an almost wholly untouched field. Arrangements were made with John S. Furnivall and Victor Purcell to undertake studies which resulted in the publication of *Colonial Policy and Practice* and *The Chinese in Southeast Asia* respectively.<sup>55</sup> Both quickly became standard references. Other arrangements led to such works as Bernard Fall's *The Viet-Minh Regime*, Ellen Hammer's *The Struggle for Indochina*, George McT. Kahin's previously cited *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff's *The Left Wing in Southeast Asia*, and William F. Wertheim's *Indonesian Society in Transition*.<sup>56</sup>

Not all attention, however, was focused on Southeast Asia. The occupation of Japan, for example, was analyzed in Jerome B. Cohen's *Japan's Economy in War and Reconstruction* and Edwin M. Martin's *The Allied Occupation of Japan* among others.<sup>57</sup> In addition, Japanese scholarship began to reappear in the form of monographs and pamphlets. Genji Okubo's *The Problems of the Emperor System in Post War Japan* and Tadao Yanaihara's *Religion and Democracy in Modern Japan* are two of many such works.<sup>58</sup> The Chinese revolution also attracted considerable

---

<sup>53</sup> See *IPR Bulletin* reports for this period.

<sup>54</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Chiang Monlin, *Tides from the West: A Chinese Autobiography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947) and Karl A. Wittfogel and Feng Chia-sheng, *History of Chinese Society: Liao, 907-1125* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1949).

<sup>55</sup> William L. Holland, "IPR Memoirs: 1946-1949." Unpublished manuscript, n.d. pp. 3-4. Personal papers of William L. Holland (hereafter cited as Holland, "Memoirs: 1946-49"). Full citations for the works referenced are John S. Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice: A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948) and Victor Purcell, *The Chinese of Southeast Asia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951).

<sup>56</sup> Holland, "Research Program," pp. 17-18. Also see *Publications on the Pacific*, post-1952 issues of *Pacific Affairs*, and related post-1952 IPR publication lists. Full citations for the works referenced are Bernard Fall, *The Viet-Minh Regime: Government and Administration in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam* (New York: Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1956); Ellen Hammer, *The Struggle for Indochina, 1940-1955* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1955); Virginia Thompson and Richard Adloff, *The Left Wing in Southeast Asia* (New York: Sloane, 1950); and William F. Wertheim, *Indonesian Society in Transition: A Study of Social Change* (The Hague: W. van Hoeve, 1956).

<sup>57</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Jerome B. Cohen, *Japan's Economy in War and Reconstruction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949) and Edwin M. Martin, *The Allied Occupation of Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1948).

<sup>58</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Genji Okubo, *The Problems of the Emperor System in Post War Japan Surveyed from an Examination of Arguments on the Subject*

attention which resulted in studies like Boyd Compton's *Mao's China*, and Fred W. Riggs's *Formosa Under Chinese Nationalist Rule*.<sup>59</sup> Even Korea, little known and less understood in the years before the outbreak of hostilities in 1950, was the subject of at least limited work, George M. McCune's *Korea Today* being the principal example.<sup>60</sup> Numerous other studies on Korea followed in the wake of the war. Finally, South Asia began to receive attention through such works as Mushtaq Ahmad's *Government and Politics in Pakistan*, and Minocheher R. Masani's *The Communist Party of India*.<sup>61</sup> In all, nearly a third of the Institute's total number of publications occurred between 1946 and 1960 despite the fact that the organization was shackled by the McCarthy movement for most of the period.

However, as the preceding titles dealing with post-war reconstruction, nationalism, revolution, and communism clearly indicate, the post-war world was radically different, and there was never any real possibility that the Institute could re-create even an approximation of its pre-war circumstances. This fact is evident in every major feature of its post-war activities. The national councils, for instance, had changed drastically in nature and outlook. The Soviet Union, now the leader of a bloc in the Cold War struggle with the West, never returned to active participation after its brief flurry of activity in the mid-1930s. China, caught in the throes of civil war and revolution, became inactive during the late 1940s, while Japan, under military occupation, was restricted from all but the most marginal participation until the 1950s.<sup>62</sup> At the same time, the demise of colonialism brought new councils into being in Burma, India, Indonesia, and Pakistan and ended the Netherlands' participation in the Institute. Further, when the conferences of this era convened, they focused upon such topics as reconstruction and nationalism rather than living standards, trade, and immigration as had been the case in the pre-war period. The research program experienced similar changes. Although it maintained a high level of production by using the time-proven techniques of the previous era— attracting the participation of scholars with the combination of research stipends, short-term appointments, and publication subsidies—the adoption of

---

(Tokyo: Japan Institute of Pacific Studies, 1948), and Tadao Yanaihara, *Religion and Democracy in Modern Japan* (Tokyo: Japan Institute of Pacific Studies, 1948).

<sup>59</sup> Full citations for the works referenced are Boyd Compton (ed. and trans), *Mao's China: Party Reform Documents, 1942-44* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1952) and Fred W. Riggs, *Formosa Under Chinese Nationalist Rule* (New York: Macmillan, 1952).

<sup>60</sup> Full citation for the work referenced is George M. McCune, *Korea Today* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950).

<sup>61</sup> Holland, "Research Program," pp. 14-16. Also see the annual reports of the American Council for this period. Full citations for the works referenced are Mushtaq Ahmad, *Government and Politics in Pakistan* (Karachi: Pakistan Publishing House, 1959), and Minocheher R. Masani, *The Communist Party of India: A Short History* (New York: Macmillan, 1954).

<sup>62</sup> Although occupation authorities allowed the revival of the Japanese Council, they would not, for example, permit a delegation to attend the Stratford conference in 1947. See Holland, "Memoirs: 1946-49," p. 5.

focused research projects that marked the earlier years ceased with the Inquiry Series. Thereafter the Institute concentrated upon identifying independent research that fit several broadly defined areas of interest and providing support leading toward its publication. While publication statistics clearly indicate that this approach was effective, it lacked the definition of the earlier undertakings.<sup>63</sup> To use Holland's expression, the organization became a sort of "scholarly mid-wife."<sup>64</sup>

Changes in the Institute's conference and research programs during these years were mild in comparison to those that occurred within its broader political environment. During the mid to late 1940s, charges that Carter had demonstrated bias against Chiang Kai-shek's government in his war relief activities escalated into full-blown accusations that the American Council was unduly sympathetic toward communism. Given the background of rising Cold War tensions and growing anti-communist sentiment in the West, it is hardly surprising that these charges were taken up by McCarthy and his supporters. This led to a host of further accusations against the Institute and various individuals associated with it. Best known in this regard are McCarthy's claim that Lattimore was the Soviet Union's principal agent in the United States and Senator McCarran's Senate Internal Security Committee's charge that the Institute was fundamentally responsible for the victory of communism in China.<sup>65</sup> Although the American Council was the actual focus of these accusations, its paramount position within the Institute made distinctions difficult, and the activities of the entire organization were called into doubt.

The story of this essentially baseless attack is told elsewhere. For present purposes, it is sufficient simply to note that events of the era seemed to conspire to lend credence to the charges and thereby diminish the Institute's ability both to defend itself and to carry on its work. The McCarthyites pressed their charges (most significantly through a lengthy investigation of the Institute during the early 1950s by Senator McCarran's committee) against a background that included the consolidation of communism in China, the outbreak of communist-initiated war in Korea, and the victory of communism in Indochina. Unfair as it may be, these and related developments created an atmosphere in which a defense of the Institute was extremely difficult. Its prominence made it an irresistible target of opportunity for the inquisitors' broadsides.

Although the Institute fought back while also attempting to carry on its regular program—indeed, a major reason the organization persisted in this environment as long as it did lies in the determination of Holland and his colleagues not to allow the accusations to dominate its agenda<sup>66</sup>—in retro-

---

<sup>63</sup> Holland, "Research Program," pp. 23-24.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>65</sup> For details of these episodes, see Thomas, *The IPR*.

<sup>66</sup> Holland, "Research Program," p. 21.

## *The Institute of Pacific Relations*

spect, at least, it was only a delaying action. The organization's base of support was consistently diminished by actions ranging from the withdrawal of support by the Rockefeller Foundation to the disaffiliation of most of the Pacific coast chapters during a time that its need for support was intensifying, and it was eventually forced into dissolution. When it finally became evident in the late 1950s that further struggle was financially impossible, arrangements were made for the University of British Columbia to assume responsibility for *Pacific Affairs* and for the University of California at Berkeley to do the same with the *Far Eastern Survey*.<sup>67</sup> These things done, the Institute was formally dissolved, a victim of both McCarthyism and its own success.<sup>68</sup>

While there is clearly reason to mourn the collapse of the Institute, it is important to understand that its contributions did not end with its formal passing. The innumerable personal acquaintances it facilitated spawned an international network of contacts that is still expanding. The academic publications it brought forth remain useful both as references and as resources for the ever growing body of new research on Asia and the Pacific. The scholars it nurtured effectively created today's Asian and Pacific studies programs and are training the successors who will carry them on in the future. The perspective on the Pacific's significance that it encouraged gained acceptance and is now widely acknowledged as an essential aspect of a balanced international outlook. In short, virtually all the major features of the Institute's activities have in some fashion continued to develop in the years since its institutional demise and, taken together, now constitute one of this century's more noteworthy achievements in this field. This is how the Institute should—and someday surely will—be remembered.

*University of Hawaii-Manoa, January 1988*

---

<sup>67</sup> In addition to assuming responsibility for *Pacific Affairs* which it has since published, the University of British Columbia invited Holland to join its faculty, establish an Asian studies program, and continue editing *Pacific Affairs*, and he did so. The *Far Eastern Survey*, subsequently retitled *Asian Survey*, has likewise continued to appear under Berkeley's imprimatur. See William L. Holland, "IPR Memoirs: 1960-1961." Unpublished manuscript, n.d., pp. 4-6. Personal papers of William L. Holland.

<sup>68</sup> The Pacific Council was dissolved in December 1960 and the American Council was dissolved in February 1961. *Ibid.*, p. 5. It should be noted that many of the former national councils still survive under the "Institute of International Affairs" or "World Affairs Council" name. This is true of Australia, Canada, Great Britain, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and Pakistan. Certain local chapters also survive. Those on the west coast of the United States were reformed as World Affairs Councils and the Honolulu chapter was reformed as the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council.