



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Barnes, D. (2015). Think Tanks and a New Order in East Asia. *Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, 22(2), pp. 89-119. doi: 10.1163/18765610-02202002

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21670/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1163/18765610-02202002>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

“Think Tanks and a New Order in East Asia:

The Council of Foreign Relations and the Institute of Pacific Relations During World War II”

Dayna Barnes

University of San Francisco

e-mail: dlbarnes2@usfca.edu

Abstract

This article considers the work of American think tanks in foreign policy-making immediately before and during World War II. It argues that two well established organizations, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Institute of Pacific Relations, were particularly influential. Both became involved in government planning for future U.S. policy in East Asia through their wartime programs. They collaborated with official U.S. government planners through outsourcing projects, hosted official and unofficial discussion groups and conferences, supported networking, and funded policy-relevant research and publications. The activities of these two organizations helped to define the range of policy options planners and politicians considered, include the ideas of outside experts into the work of government, and facilitate cooperation between the United States and its allies on postwar planning. The interaction between the U.S. government and interwar think tanks had a lasting impact on American-East Asian relations.

Keywords

Japan; World War II; postwar U.S.-East Asian relations; think tanks; Council on Foreign Relations; Institute of Pacific Relations; U.S. foreign policy

On the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the executive director of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) wrote a letter about private political organizations in the United States. In this letter, Walter Mallory challenged the idea that his organization had a special role in American political life. The council, he claimed, was not exceptional. There were many “groups in the United States dealing with or capable of dealing with questions of our foreign relations.” Americans were anxious about the global crisis. “Every club,” he argued, had such a forum and “every church deals with such matters in some form or another. At every dinner party (of intelligent people) the conversation these days turns on foreign policy.” He estimated that there were 20,000 such organizations in the United States at the time.¹ Despite Walter Mallory’s protestations, the Council on Foreign Relations was in an unusual position. There indeed may have been 20,000 groups interested in foreign relations at the eve of U.S. entrance into World War II, but few were significant in the country’s policy-making process. Two organizations, Mallory’s council and the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), held a special place in U.S. policy planning. Through their wartime programs both became directly and indirectly involved in official postwar planning for the future of East Asia and the U.S. role there.

In the early wartime period, a lack of government resources and interest stunted official U.S. long-range planning. The bureaucrats in charge of American foreign policy therefore came to rely on information and expertise from outside the U.S. government as they formed their views. Specialist research organizations, later known as “think tanks,” leapt to fill gaps in official knowledge. They provided reports and recommendations that their specific institutional viewpoints informed. The IPR and CFR were established and well-regarded institutions that could draw on relevant member expertise. The IPR benefitted from its regional specialization, occupying a position as the largest and most important group focused on the Pacific. The CFR,

an outspoken advocate of American expansionism, gained influence through its elite membership and connections. Think tanks provided significant and accessible information, maintained personal networks between members and policymakers, and created space for officials and private experts from the business and scholarly communities to discuss ideas. Their fingerprints are apparent on the plans that the United States had in place as it embarked on its postwar interventions in East Asia.

This article considers the background of these two organizations and their wartime programs. It also describes the needs of the State Department that opened it to possible cooperation with non-state organizations. It examines the methods of involvement the IPR and CFR employed in the official planning processes and the ideas each highlighted. During World War II, both organizations were directly involved in planning through collaboration with U.S. government agencies and became semi-official spaces for research work and meetings. The groups also supported and influenced planning indirectly through providing unofficial “thinking spaces” for the use of officials, sharing resources, and through the social and professional relationships between members and officials. Both organizations had international reach. They linked planning groups in the United States with those in other Allied nations and, as a result, contributed to the sharing of information and ideas. This article highlights the role think tanks played in developing American postwar planning for East Asia, focusing particularly on the treatment of a defeated Japan.

The place of think tanks in policy making is the subject of increasing academic attention, rising in tandem with interest in non-state actors in diplomatic history.² Existing works on the Council on Foreign Relations have highlighted the early war period as the “golden age” of the council’s influence.³ However, these studies have tended to focus their attention on wartime

planning on Europe and the development of the United Nations to the neglect of the part that the council played in developing Asia policy. Yukata Sasaki also has made a comparison of the CFR and IPR in an edited volume on World War II. However, his chapter does not emphasize the importance of creating policy networks or consider the wartime programs that were the most effective.⁴ Other scholars also have recognized the Institute of Pacific Relations as significant in policy making. Tomoko Akami's work, for example, provides a broad picture of the role that this international organization played in regional integration from 1919 to 1945. This article will focus on the IPR's impact on the domestic policy of one member state during World War II.⁵

In 1921, the merger of two very different groups of East Coast internationalists created the Council on Foreign Relations. One was the American Institute of International Affairs, an organization of scholars brought together to advise President Woodrow Wilson after World War I. The other was a group of internationally minded and successful businessmen and lawyers who met at exclusive dinners to discuss the issues of the day. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the CFR brought together outside experts and political leaders to discuss with its carefully selected elite membership important issues of international affairs and regional developments through study groups, dinners, and reports. During this period, the council also excluded women and in practice minorities from membership. Beginning in 1922, the CFR used *Foreign Affairs* to reach beyond its influential membership to influence the informed public. The journal took as its mission to "guide American public opinion" by becoming the "natural medium of the best thought" in the United States and Europe.⁶ As a result of council activities, its members were well informed about current events around the world.

As Japan's foreign policy grew increasingly aggressive following its withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933, the CFR's members frequently debated the potential impact of this

Far Eastern crisis on U.S. interests and the appropriate American response. The council's dinner series, appealing to a wide section of council membership, drew fire for its contentious choice to invite representatives of the Japanese government to address the group in the first half of the decade.⁷ The *Foreign Affairs* journal, under the editorial guidance of the fiery internationalist Hamilton Fish Armstrong, devoted many of its pages to expert analyses of the situation in Asia. Notably, an entire issue in 1938 dealt with the war in China. In addition, the Far East Study Group focused the council's East Asian experts on the breakdown of order in Asia in the face of Japanese militarism. CFR members with an interest in Asia were for the most part businessmen with economic interests there, government officials working on the region, and academics who specialized in the study of China or Japan.⁸ At the time war broke out in Europe in 1939, the CFR was one of the few groups engaged in informed debate on events in Asia and on American interests and policy options in an increasingly unstable world system.

Conspiracy theorists have viewed the Council on Foreign Relations with suspicion because of its elite membership of influential and wealthy representatives from the East Coast establishment.⁹ Corporate leaders within the council certainly pushed the organization toward the promotion of expanded American trade and investment abroad.¹⁰ Such aims fit with the organization's approach to foreign policy. Within the wider organization, and in sharp contrast to public sentiment, members shared a vision of an active United States defending its growing interests around the world. The CFR held this positive internationalist view since its creation, which has directed its discussions and publications ever since. In the introduction to a council-commissioned history of the organization written in 1996, the president of the CFR explained the uniting vision of council members. "If the Council as a body," he wrote, "has stood for anything these 75 years, it has been for American internationalism based on American interests."¹¹ While

this common starting point by no means led to agreement between members on interpretations of specific issues, it did ensure that whatever position council members might take would support an increased American role in the world and look to protect American interests globally.

The Institute of Pacific Relations was established in Honolulu in 1925 with the mission of supporting the creation of a Pacific regional community. It quickly expanded to include national councils representing the major Asian and Pacific countries, including the United States, Soviet Union, Canada, China, Japan, New Zealand, and Australia, as well as European nations with colonial holdings in East Asia—Britain, France, and the Netherlands. In the United States and across the English-speaking world, the IPR became the major vehicle for collaboration between East Asia experts and for initiating and publishing research on the region. “In the 1930s and ‘40s,” as renowned historian John Fairbank explains, “a great part of the literature available in English on contemporary East Asia was produced . . . [under the] inspiration and supervision” of the IPR.¹² The IPR’s influence on the field of Asia studies and among expert observers and government officials was so strong because the discipline was small and the organization had little competition.¹³ As American interaction with Asian countries increased, so did the reliance of U.S. government officials on the IPR for information and analysis. During World War II, they had to lean especially hard on the IPR, the only expert group focusing on Pacific affairs, because the potential pool of specialists was so shallow and the level of common knowledge so low.

The IPR was a more complex type of organization than the CFR. One can consider it both an American think tank and an international non-governmental organization (INGO) because it had a multi-level organizational structure. During the war period, the organization consisted of an International Secretariat, located in New York, which sat above a number of national councils representing academics, experts, and businessmen with an interest in the

Pacific region. Each of the national councils maintained its own research programs and relationship with its home government. For example, the Far Eastern Committee of Chatham House, sister organization of the CFR and during the war closely connected with the Foreign Office, served as the British national council of the IPR.¹⁴ Although as a whole the IPR operated as an INGO, the vast majority of funds and major research initiatives came from American members and American philanthropic organizations. As a result, other member countries viewed it as a potential vehicle for projecting U.S. influence or, as former Australian minister to China and member Sir Frederic Eggleston put it, “an American Propagandist organisation [*sic*].”¹⁵ Significantly, Americans dominated the International Secretariat in New York, which set the agenda for the IPR. For these reasons, and because it was mainly the International Secretariat and the American Council of the Institute on Pacific Relations (ACIPR) that were involved in Washington planning circles, this article will not consider the work of other national councils, except as they interacted with the ACIPR and participated in its wartime international meetings. It also will use the acronym “IPR” to indicate the International Secretariat and the ACIPR, which in the context of wartime policy-planning activities operated as a single American think tank.

The IPR moved its headquarters from Hawaii to New York City in 1934. With the move, the organization shifted its focus from economic and cultural affairs to politics and international relations. The developing crisis in East Asia further reinforced this trend.¹⁶ Because of the international aspect of the organization, which included national councils from warring China and Japan, the conflict in Asia impacted the IPR and placed increasing demands on its resources even before Pearl Harbor in a way in which domestic or Atlantic-focused organizations did not experience.¹⁷ In 1938 and 1939, the IPR sponsored a series of conferences on U.S. Far East policy and the Sino-Japanese War, inviting academics, businessmen, and influential figures to

discuss policy options and strategy. To address these issues and increase the amount of useful information available to the American public and U.S. policymakers, the IPR established a series entitled “the Inquiry” that published volumes on domestic and international situations, including postwar plans for Japan, throughout the war.¹⁸ With the rare resource of area specialists and a mission to promote Pacific regionalism, the IPR was well placed to play a significant role in U.S.-East Asian relations during World War II.

At the start of the Sino-Japanese war in July 1937, both the CFR and IPR were interested in affecting U.S. policy-making. Networking brought these groups into official planning, and members were absorbed into the government during the war. Both groups also developed publications that increased the amount of available knowledge on Asia. In addition, the IPR engaged in resource sharing with U.S. government agencies and hosted “semi-official” domestic and international conferences that U.S. officials attended. The CFR’s single most important wartime program was the War and Peace Studies (WPS) Project, an unprecedented secret collaboration between the organization and the State Department. It also continued to host study groups that became involved in planning. The Far East Study Group attracted key figures in Japanese-American relations, including high-level U.S. government officials and leading experts on Asia. As the situation in Asia deteriorated, the group became a forum for long-range planning on Japan and East Asia. Members, informed by study group debates, were or would become actively involved in U.S. interactions with Japan. The study group provided planners with a forum to discuss key questions of American policy in East Asia with other government officials, academics, and business leaders.

What made the increased wartime activity of these organizations possible was funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, a philanthropic organization with the mission of promoting the

“well-being of humanity around the world.”¹⁹ Paralleling the CFR and the IPR, it was an internationalist organization that envisioned a greater American role in global affairs. The foundation supplied both organizations with substantial additional emergency funds to cover the cost of increased activities, as well as earmarking funds to support special programs.²⁰ Crucially, increased Rockefeller Foundation support began well before the United States entered World War II. This gave the IPR and CFR a “head start” in handling the issues that later would become important in the Pacific theater of the war. With the help of the Rockefeller Foundation, the think tanks could engage in in-house research and thoughtful planning on issues and interests. Before Pearl Harbor, these were luxuries that cash-strapped U.S. government agencies like the State Department could not afford.

Despite the growing worldwide interests of the United States, the State Department in the 1930s was not the vast, well-resourced institution that it later became. The Great Depression had forced hiring freezes and fifty percent salary cuts within the department in the early 1930s. In 1937, the year the Sino-Japanese War broke out, the Far East Division of the State Department was poorly resourced and understaffed. Division Chief Stanley K. Hornbeck reported that year that his section was unable to do all the work he thought it ought to. He noted that “a great deal of ‘planning’ might to advantage be engaged in” by the division. However, long-term thinking was not possible for his “overworked” staff, which struggled to handle “day-to-day current questions which are presented to it and which require immediate attention.” Without additional resources or staff, Hornbeck explained, it would be “almost impossible” for the division to give “concentrated thought and careful study to questions of major policy and to the formulating of suggestions for possible programs of future action.”²¹ The outbreak of war in Europe and Asia exacerbated the situation, which forced the State Department to focus almost exclusively on

immediate issues. The Far East Division, for example, had a staff of only eleven officers in 1939.²² For this reason, officials at the State Department were eager to accept the outside expertise and resources that the IPR and CFR were able to offer.

Expertise on Asia was particularly hard to find in this era both within and outside the State Department. Acknowledging this difficulty, a leading China expert at the CFR wrote that while there were many available authorities on European countries, U.S. government and private institutions quickly discover “how hard it is to find people who really know what’s what in Asia.” “A natural result of this,” he continued, “is that in our councils and deliberations, in the discussion that goes on before policy is determined, the preponderant weight is on Europe.”²³ The specter of war in Europe dominated U.S. foreign policy discussions in the second half of the 1930s. Hornbeck, who was also a member of the CFR Far East Study Group, noted in 1940 how “it is undoubtedly true that the European war has taken attention away from the Far East.”²⁴ Even for groups specifically interested in events in Asia, the lack of experts limited discussion. In 1944, a CFR Economic and Financial planning group working on postwar Asia suggested that debate about the future of China “might be a topic which the Group might discuss further and fruitfully even though experts are not available to discuss China’s problem in a detailed way.”²⁵ In this and similar cases, generalists were left to speculate about the politics of Asian countries in the absence of expert analysis.

U.S. government policy planners, lacking in background and detailed knowledge of Asia, were dependent on the limited number of Asia experts to develop ideas for the future of Asia and American interests there. These experts sometimes used their influence to push personal biases. Owen Lattimore was a particularly influential member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He was involved as an Asia expert in each of the CFR projects this article discusses. Lattimore had

spent years in Asia and was one of the few Americans who spoke fluent Chinese in this period. He impressed many people as the foremost American Asia expert. He was also a Sinophile who hoped to use his knowledge of China to build American support for the Chinese cause in general and for the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi) in particular. Lattimore was described by a contemporary as “widely known in this country [the United States] both for his scholarship and for his steadfast championship of China’s cause.”²⁶

Lattimore’s personal identification with China, however, may have undermined his analysis of current events and limited his value, if not his reputation, as an expert. In lectures, he referred to the feelings of “we Chinese” and was known for his unshakable belief in the inherent democratic nature of China.²⁷ While he admitted that China was not yet democratic in a political sense, Lattimore informed his colleagues that China represented “a democratic type of society.” In 1942, he argued at a planning meeting that he was able to assess political developments in China from Washington by reading Chinese newspapers. Despite being uniform, centrally disseminated, and limited to topics the government approved, Lattimore stated that Chinese news was free, first class, and a reliable source for information on the domestic political situation. Lattimore’s connection with China also colored his view of Japan and the Japanese. He wrote in a War and Peace Studies report that while “the Chinese would carry on the fight regardless of economic trials and tribulations,” the Japanese were “unusually subject” to mass panic and hysteria, making it easy to defeat them.²⁸ Asia specialists like Lattimore were in a position to influence the thinking of officials and council members who were often without recourse to second opinions on events in East Asia.

Because the efforts of the Institute of Pacific Relations focused primarily on Asia, it did not struggle with the bias of Euro-centrism or lack of Asia experts as did the U.S. government

and the CFR. The IPR too sought a greater role in official policymaking during World War II. It aimed to establish close liaison with key Allied governments in London, Ottawa, Canberra, and Chungking. The creation of a Washington office, however, was to be the primary driver of IPR influence. The organization hoped that proximity and personal networks would encourage U.S. officials to draw on IPR publications to inform their decisions. Moreover, IPR resources could provide official planners with “imaginative thinking about the broad problems of the war and post-war period.”²⁹ The IPR also aimed pamphlets and more popular publications at the public, “to develop in America a realistic understanding of the Pacific half of the world.”³⁰ As readers will discover below, although the U.S. government recruited specialists from the ranks of the IPR, the group had more limited and indirect influence on policymaking than did the CFR.

The IPR’s interest in Asia did not begin with the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War or in response to threats to American interests there. All of its members were interested in Asia, and the IPR became an important source of information and expertise for the U.S. government during World War II. The institute fostered its networks with policy planners, hosting conferences that, like the CFR study groups, facilitated focused debate. As an organization with an international, not only American, character the IPR also played a crucial role in moving the debate beyond domestic forums and highlighting for American planners the different viewpoints and aims of other nations. Especially in the period before Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor early in December 1941, the State Department lacked the resources to carry out extensive work on long-range issues in East Asia on its own. For this reason, the CFR and IPR were able to play a significant role in policy planning as a consequence of making their organizations available for government use.

The outbreak of war in Europe provided a catalyst for the Council on Foreign Relations to move beyond its usual activities in an effort to affect U.S. policy directly. In September 1939,

CFR leaders visited Assistant Secretary of State George Messersmith. They struck a deal for the creation of a secret project to provide the State Department with studies, memoranda, and policy recommendations based on the long-term foreign policy interests of the United States as the council's leaders defined them. The CFR created the War and Peace Studies (WPS) Project to "investigate the effects of war upon the interests and policies of the United States, to prepare for the Government's use material bearing on the postwar settlement, and to provide background for the transmission to the office of the Secretary of State of such information and reliable opinion as may be of use in the formulation of policy."³¹ Messersmith wrote that he believed the project "could prove extremely helpful" because, although the department would give thought to the same problems, "its staff was so preoccupied with current questions requiring immediate action on matters of policy, that it did not have the time to devote to long-range considerations."³² Through the WPS Project, members of the Council on Foreign Relations became "external bureaucrats," directly involved in discussions and writing draft policy memorandum.³³

WPS Project working groups created reports and recommendations on specific issues at the request of State Department officials and on their own initiative. The drafters then sent copies of these memoranda to the State Department, the vice president, and the president, forwarding them as well to other departments and outside individuals at the State Department's discretion. High-level U.S. officials sent glowing testimonials about the value of this secret project to the CFR's funding body throughout the period. In 1940, Secretary of State Cordell Hull wrote in a letter to CFR President Norman H. Davis that the "excellent memoranda" of the WPS Project had been "very useful," adding that he was "sure that they will be of even greater use when the day for reconstruction comes at the end of hostilities [*sic*]."³⁴ Indeed, U.S. government departments circulated and commented on the memoranda throughout the war. In

1944, the Japan Branch at the War Department received a document titled “Security Policy Vis-à-vis Japan” for comment before its return to Eugene Dooman of the State Department’s Far East Division. Dooman wrote of the report that “the paper under examination is the most satisfactory discussion of the subject I have seen.”³⁵ Such statements and decisions to circulate drafts outside the State Department demonstrate that WPS Project reports on Japan were integrated into U.S. government planning.

Although State Department officials chose to circulate WPS Project reports externally, the CFR kept its goal “limited to helping the State Department do its job well.”³⁶ The council made this decision deliberately because senior members agreed that the selection process for wider circulation “might be invidious,” especially as the CFR would have to limit the distribution to keep the project secret and the reports confidential.³⁷ The CFR rejected requests from Leo Pasvolsky, the State Department’s director of the Division of Special Research, and Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles for the group to distribute its memoranda more widely within the U.S. government. Although the CFR shared reports with other departments, the WPS Project continued to work exclusively with the State Department throughout its existence.

In 1942, the State Department created a postwar planning project of its own, but continued working closely with the Council on Foreign Relations. The WPS Project had divided into working groups, of which the ones on Political, Territorial, and Economic-Financial affairs handled East Asian issues. The new official project mirrored this structure. Also, the U.S. government hired CFR research secretaries to act as liaisons between the corresponding State Department and Council on Foreign Relations committees. The secretary of state’s decision to approach official postwar planning by “setting up a parallel organization [to the WPS Project] within the State Department itself” was a tribute to the council’s influence in policy-making.³⁸

The council prepared outlines for structuring the new State Department groups, although Armstrong was careful to point out that the CFR had no “idea of telling the State Department how it ought to organize its own work,” but intended merely to facilitate decision-making.³⁹ The new Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy, which would approve the drafts the State Department’s working groups produced, included several top CFR representatives. Pasvolsky, who headed the whole project, was himself a council member.

However, cooperation between the council’s WPS Project groups and State Department committees was not always easy. Pasvolsky was ambitious and eager to build up his own team. He was therefore at times reluctant to accept CFR help and advice. Council research secretaries that the U.S. government had hired to act as liaisons between the State Department and the WPS Project, were “rather miffed” to find they were not always welcome at meetings or privy to reports.⁴⁰ However, because training new experts was a difficult process, the WPS Project remained an important source of policy planning long after the creation of a State Department committee. Isaiah Bowman wrote that despite the “Department’s heroic efforts to assemble a team of so-called experts and train them in the preparation of memoranda on significant questions,” it was not unusual that “Council Memoranda were the only things available in semi-mature form.”⁴¹ The “head start” that the WPS groups provided, and the inclusion of top CFR members in the Postwar Programs Committee (PWC), ensured that the council remained enmeshed in the official U.S. planning process.

The State Department suspended its Advisory Committee in July 1943 and replaced with a series of country and area committees that prepared policies for the approval of the new Postwar Programs Committee (PWC). The CFR’s involvement continued even after this change, although the organization became less influential as the planning circle widened. Council

member Pasvolsky still headed the PWC and retained key members of the WPS Project, including Norman Davis and Isaiah Bowman, who had headed the WPS Project's Territorial Group. In December 1944, the State Department replaced the Postwar Planning Committee again, this time with an interdepartmental committee—the State War Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC). It did not include CFR members in this new committee, which was composed of department secretaries and under-secretaries, but the new Far East Sub-committee did contain council members. It also received previous reports, with which the CFR had been involved, as a starting point for further postwar planning on Japan. The work of the CFR fed directly into the official policies that the SWNCC drafted and the U.S. government adopted as official policy after Japan surrendered in 1945.

In keeping with the organizational outlook of the Council on Foreign Relations, the WPS Project consistently provided the State Department with recommendations for increasing U.S. control in East Asia. This went so far as advocating the expansion of American imperialism to replace the crumbling European empires there. In the early days of planning, uncertainty about the postwar situation made it difficult for the WPS Project to develop recommendations for the postwar international system. While members hoped for stability based on some kind of regional organization, they doubted the possibility of international cooperation in the Pacific. They were, however, certain of the need for an expanded American role in East Asia. In 1940, the WPS Project's Territorial Group made a remarkable suggestion for increasing American influence in the Pacific. The group suggested that the U.S. military might provide naval support of British interests in the Pacific until Britain was in a position to return with “full power and prestige,” even though this could lead the United States into undesirable long-term imperial commitments if Britain were not able to resume her role in the region quickly.⁴²

The long-term picture remained unclear after the sudden entrance of the United States into World War II. In 1942, planning for future engagement in the Pacific was difficult because council members did not know if the United States would “be forced . . . to carry heavy responsibilities in this region virtually alone,” or if it would be able to share responsibilities “with other strong and reasonably stable political units.”⁴³ In this uncertain environment, the WPS Project presented the option of American control over the region if “complete Asiatic freedom [from Western imperialism]” proved impractical, advising that security had to take precedence over the aspirations of the Chinese. A report pointed to the U.S. “good neighbor policy” in Latin America as evidence that “overwhelming power need not result in that abuse of power characteristic of imperialism.”⁴⁴ In other words, American imperialism in Asia would not be an unsatisfactory course of action. This suggestion was a radical departure from anti-imperialist attitudes evident in both official and public sentiment.

Rather than an American empire, some members of the WPS Project believed that a new balance of power in Asia would be the best option for American interests. As “Japan will no longer be in a position to act as a balance against the Soviet [Union],” this argument went, “it will be to America’s interest to strengthen China to the point where that gap will be filled.” Isaiah Bowman sounded an unusual note of caution against making such commitments in Asia. He noted that although the United States could be “forced to play an active role in Far Eastern politics” after the war, that was a serious decision for the American people to make.⁴⁵ The Council on Foreign Relations generally supported an active U.S. foreign policy, but its discussion groups had room for a range of options within that framework.

After the Cairo Declaration, which followed an Allied conference in late November 1943, WPS Project planners began to expect that international cooperation would be a key feature of

postwar Asia. However, even if such cooperation were possible, its members concluded, any arrangements would need to recognize “widespread” American interests “throughout the Pacific.” In addition, installations in the Philippines and seized Japanese territories would reinforce U.S. military strength. Members of the WPS Project’s Armaments Group expected that the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, China, and Canada would be the great powers in the postwar Far East, with no role for Japan. Despite the involvement of many countries, Britain and the United States would dominate as the “chief nuclei” for regional organization with responsibility for enforcement in much of Asia. The Soviet Union and the United States would determine security policy for the North Pacific.⁴⁶

Another of the CFR’s programs, the Far East Study Group, provided a forum for officials and experts to discuss the future of East Asia, exerting indirect influence on postwar planning for Japan. It ran annual sessions during which members would meet regularly to discuss key issues in East Asia. The study group served both to educate interested council members and provide a “thinking space” for specialists. Because think tank forums were not official, individuals could use them as “sounding boards” to test new positions without commitment.⁴⁷ Members of the Far East Study Group included Stanley K. Hornbeck, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, and leading Asia experts and advisers. Several members of the study group later were involved in the administration of the occupation of Japan. The State Department appointed Professor George Blakeslee, for example, to head its Area Committee on the Far East, which made policy recommendations to the PWC and the SWNCC on postwar Japan. Major General Frank McCoy would become the head of the Far East Commission, which advised Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers General Douglas MacArthur during the occupation of Japan.

The Far East Study Group’s creation of a shared conceptual framework among influential

study group members helped to define U.S. interests and potential actions. Its actions typified how the CFR study groups were useful for “clarifying and giving precision to the thinking of the participants on key issues of American foreign policy.” More importantly, the council hoped that the groups would “serve as a medium in which responsible opinion may be formulated and transmitted to policy-making officials.”⁴⁸ In response to Pearl Harbor, the Far East Study Group made preparation of policy recommendations a priority.⁴⁹ Because the CFR records were closed for the lifetime of involved members, study group participants had a unique forum for thrashing out positions with the aid of other Asia experts and without concern for outside criticism.

The CFR regarded Japanese expansionism as a threat to its ideal of increasing U.S. trade and investment in East Asia. The Far East Study Group saw a paradox in the deep economic ties the United States had with Japan and its support for China in the Sino-Japanese War. A 1939 report advised that continuing trade with Japan also would require abandoning rhetorical support for China. “The present policy of trading with Japan and at the same time morally supporting China,” it explained, “makes enemies of both.” Accepting Japanese expansion with “a policy of appeasement” also would act against U.S. interests in the long run because Japanese domination in Asia would undermine American business there.⁵⁰ Influential figures voiced similar concerns in CFR forums. In 1940, Lattimore argued that an “unfriendly or monopolistic nation” in control of Southeast Asia—a clear reference to Japan—would damage U.S. interests. The United States was interested in having access to raw materials located there, such as tin and rubber, as well as sea and air routes. Secretary of State Hull pointed out that this also would threaten U.S. allies. Japanese expansion could cut Britain off from much needed economic resources. This would be “more damaging to British defense in Europe perhaps than any other step short of a German

crossing of the [English] channel.”⁵¹ The group thus considered an embargo against Japan to be in American interests, even at the cost of losing an important trading partner.

CFR members continued to debate the merits of appeasement and embargo. After a series of discussions on the basis of peace between the United States and Japan a month before the attack on Pearl Harbor, they agreed to a set of minimum requirements for accommodation with Japan. The United States could resume friendly relations if Japan would agree to two conditions—the withdrawal of troops in China to north of the Great Wall and allowing greater economic security and opportunities for the United States in China. In return, study group members agreed that the United States could accept Indochina as a Japanese protectorate and Japan’s retention of Manchuria.⁵² The group’s concern for preserving U.S. trade interests explain these remarkably generous terms.. Lattimore remained opposed to accommodation with Japan. Hornbeck too was consistent and outspoken in his commitment to the return of Manchuria to China. In his copy of a China Study Group memorandum, Hornbeck double underlined in red a passage about the importance of returning Manchuria to China. He even wrote “Hear hear!” in the margin.⁵³ Hornbeck had spoken against accommodation with Japan in previous meetings, commenting that the United States would “get nowhere by sympathizing with Japan’s needs in the present situation.”⁵⁴ However, he also had been involved in the diplomatic negotiations with Japan throughout the previous summer, making him aware that the United States was not willing to make the concessions the study group was considering.

Barring accommodation with Japan, the study group considered the necessity of an embargo to weaken the Japanese position. One report from January 1940 explained that “there is an increased feeling that we should do something for China, and the most frequently suggested way of doing something is to embargo our exports to Japan.” But the group did not consider

seriously other methods of checking Japan's expansion, including the threat of armed U.S. intervention. Its members thought that the public supported an embargo "not because people have much conviction in this particular measure but because they felt something must be done."⁵⁵ However, the strong and opposing opinions of some members prevented the group from reaching a consensus on the issue.

William Herod of International General Electric made the case for business opposition to embargo. "I do not believe," he informed the group, "in the imposition of an embargo as an expression of moral indignation." Herod argued that the use of embargo as a political tool in any situation would be damaging to American business interests. "If we pursue an 'in and out' policy in respect to foreign trade," he explained to his fellow group members, "American foreign businesses can have little confidence in the future." Moreover, Herod stated that an embargo was likely to be costly "in the loss of trade and opportunities" and ineffective as a deterrent to Japan.⁵⁶ Asia expert Nathaniel Peffer took a different view. He argued that "by refusing to buy goods from Japan, the United States would stop helping Japan with the war." An embargo, Peffer believed, would be an effective means of reducing Japan's ability to make war in East Asia. He stated that employing an embargo on "cotton and silk alone . . . would do tremendous damage."⁵⁷ This dispute never reached resolution within the group, and events would overtake the question of an accommodation with Japan.

The most important question that the Far East Study Group faced during World War II was creating a plan for what they called a "new order in the Far East." Between 1942 and 1945, study group members debated whether a balance of power, regional, or international system would best suit American interests in postwar East Asia. Nicholas Spykman, chair of the International Relations Department at Yale University, argued that the United States ought to

keep postwar Japan and China balanced as powers. A weakened Japan, he explained, “would be at the mercy of China.” For this reason, Spykman argued that the United States should make adjustments to “allow Japan to be strong enough for self-defense and yet prevent her from over-running China.”⁵⁸ In 1944, the CFR added a Chinese-American Study Group to its Far East program. This group made a case similar to Spykman’s, suggesting that the United States needed a strong postwar China to check any possibility for a resurgence of Japanese imperialism. Postwar security required that China “restrain the Japanese until it is clear that their word can be trusted.”⁵⁹ The Chinese-American Study Group, however, was not concerned with Japan’s defense against China. It argued that because Japanese heavy industry was new and entirely military in character, the Allies could destroy it after the war.

The majority of group members supported the idea of creating a U.S.-dominated regional organization in postwar Asia to ensure security and economic integration. During discussion of the issue in 1942, however, Hornbeck rejected the idea because he believed that the Allies would not be able to agree on a regional partner for the organization. He explained that the regional organization plan

raises the question as to where the center of gravity would be in the Far East. Would it be Japan or China? If the former, the United States would object; if the latter, we would approve but either the U.S.S.R. or Great Britain or some of the Dominions might object.

Despite Hornbeck’s comments, the Far East Study Group reached agreement at the meeting in April 1942 that “as a group,” it believed in “the principle of organized international cooperation for the Pacific with the United States as a partner either in a regional or global organization.”⁶⁰ Significantly, its consensus on this issue was ahead of its time. Congress would pass similar resolutions a year and a half later, after an extended period of debate and public outreach. The

regional organization idea later gave way to an international organization after the concept of a United Nations organization gained saliency in U.S. postwar planning.

The Far East Study Group provided its influential members with a “thinking space” for reflection and hashing out ideas. Group meetings identified key issues in U.S.-Japanese relations and the postwar order in East Asia and worked to build a consensus on U.S. strategy. Members spent time considering courses of action to curb an aggressive Japan before the war, and various international systems to replace the shattered order in postwar East Asia. Participants discussed the value and viability of building a strong regional partner—Japan or China—to work with the United States, and the merits of a U.S.-dominated regional organization. Even when unable to reach consensus, the group provided government officials, academics, and business leaders with a forum where they were exposed to a range of opinions about key questions of U.S. policy in East Asia. Not only did this indirectly influence on U.S. postwar planning, many participants were or would become actively involved in wartime planning for the occupation of Japan.

The single greatest contribution of the Institute on Pacific Relations to postwar planning was its domestic and international conferences. Like the CFR study groups, the IPR conferences offered officials a venue for informal and unofficial discussion. What the IPR termed “conference diplomacy”—known as “track II diplomacy” or “nongovernmental and unofficial forums” in modern political science—offered important benefits to official U.S. policy formulation.⁶¹ These were semi-official spaces, unofficial gatherings of officials in a private capacity. Here, experts and interested parties inside and outside of government shared more openly information, perspectives, and ideas. The IPR hosted a number of domestic conferences during the war through the ACIPR. These helped circulate ideas between IPR members, opinion leaders, and government officials. The national councils of other countries could submit papers

for the Americans to consider.⁶² It also held two international conferences, both of which considered the treatment of postwar Japan and the aims of any future occupation.⁶³

Partially because of the value of the conferences as “sounding boards” for national policy, as well as the fact that so many IPR members were drawn into government service during the war years, the major IPR conferences included many officials acting as observers or delegates. Although these men attended in a private capacity, other attendees considered them as representing the perspectives of their home nations because of their closeness to policymaking.⁶⁴ Attending officials brought information back to their home governments and drew on discussions while developing policy. The U.S. government’s interdepartmental planning committee appointed Robert Fearey, a young officer in the committee, to write a paper on the possibility of creating a regency system in postwar Japan “in view of his familiarity with the discussions on this subject at the Institute of Pacific Relations conference.”⁶⁵ IPR conferences brought experts together, established valuable personal working relationships, spread ideas, and generated energy around policy issues. This was particularly important because national viewpoints on questions related to the future of Japan differed dramatically.

To maintain Allied unity, governments were reluctant to discuss divergent postwar plans, especially through formal channels. The treatment of postwar Japan was a potentially explosive issue, as highlighting the different national interests of the Allies potentially could undermine the war effort. The IPR played a particularly important role in relaying viewpoints and building consensus on the Japan question. American planners intended that their country would lead policy after victory, but there was no set official U.S. line on postwar plans before summer 1945. A reluctance to share information on an official level, competing interests between Allies, and policy uncertainty meant that the discussions and position papers at the wartime international

conferences provided a crucial link between experts and officials from Allied nations. During these debates on postwar East Asia, three nations dominated—the United States, Britain, and Australia. The Soviet Union did not enter the war with Japan until August 1945. Although the Chinese delegation was outspoken at IPR conferences, the weakness of the Nationalist government in power there undermined China's influence. The Netherlands and France maintained stakeholder positions as colonial powers, but German occupation had crippled both. Of this group, the Americans held the preponderance of power in directing Allied policy.

In February 1945, John Sterndale Bennett, head of the British Foreign Office Far Eastern Department, provided a neat summary of Britain's position on postwar planning generally:

[O]ur objectives are simple—to recover and revive our territories, to beat the Japanese and to build a better world. I do not see that we need hesitate to proclaim the programme [*sic*] to Americans or despair of cooperating with them on the basis of it.⁶⁶

This view was optimistic. Americans and other Allied nations were deeply suspicious of British imperial interests, and divergent views on Japan were a source of contention. The possible economic rehabilitation of Japan would create a rival for British industry, but a lucrative market and trading partner to the United States.⁶⁷ Britain, in common with Japan, had an empire and a monarchy. It therefore supported a moderate policy of limited reform in postwar Japan relying on an “old guard” of westernized prewar liberals and the retention of the Emperor, instead of a radical change to the state.⁶⁸ Suspicion of continued British imperialism, along with concern about American willingness to make and keep substantial postwar commitments, were the main sources of tension in inter-Allied planning during the early phase of World War II.⁶⁹

Australia also held a distinct position on postwar Japan. Unlike Britain, or, despite the events at Pearl Harbor, the United States, Japanese expansion directly threatened Australian

domestic security. As a result, the country had a significant interest in developing a system of international collective security and monitoring Japan to guard against future remilitarization. The Australian Council called for soft peace terms on trade and recognition of some of Japan's war aims, notably ending European imperialism in the Pacific and even holding out the possibility of special access to the Chinese market for Japan. The Australians advocated a combination of containment and conciliation for postwar Japan.⁷⁰

In both Britain and Australia, understanding and adapting to American policy was the chief priority for postwar planning on Japan. While the British did have a clear position on the Japan question, it was by no means the country's most pressing concern. British officials and politicians were willing to compromise and defer to the Americans in return for concessions elsewhere. Despite this flexibility, the British had only very limited access to detailed American plans.⁷¹ The war revealed the illusion of security membership within the British Empire. Britain's "deplorable tendency . . . to relegate Australia to a subordinate status" and fail to consult with them on important issues frustrated the Australians.⁷² They were therefore anxious to understand American plans to contain the Japanese threat and rebuild stability in the region. As the Department of External Affairs observer to the Mont Tremblant conference in Canada reported, achieving the postwar aims of Australia would "depend largely on the collaboration of the United States."⁷³ However, these allies received only a vague picture of future U.S. policy toward East Asia on which their own national security depended.⁷⁴

The Americans too used IPR conferences to gauge the aims of their allies. In December 1942, for example, President Roosevelt asked Vice President Henry Wallace, who attended the Mont Tremblant conference, if the British had taken a hard line on imperialism there.⁷⁵ State Department planning groups cited and used IPR conference discussions.⁷⁶ Given the resistance

to discussing postwar plans on an official level, and the importance of the issue, the wartime conferences of the IPR offered a rare and valuable chance to discuss national approaches to the question of Japan. Thus, the Institute of Pacific Relations influenced the occupation of Japan as a consequence of its facilitating planning between Allies.

By the start of the first wartime conference, the national council of Japan had ceased cooperation. Since there never had been councils for Italy or Germany, the IPR became an organization of Allied member states. Thus, observers regarded the international conferences as “Allied policy forums,” an impression reinforced by the fact that almost half of conference attendees were government officials.⁷⁷ The two 1942 conferences, although they convened at a time when defeat of Japan was by no means a foregone conclusion, considered questions about the requirements for future peace in East Asia, the role of the United States in the region, and the future of Japan and its colonies. The first conference at Princeton University in August set the agenda on Far Eastern postwar planning in preparation for the larger second international meeting in December at Mont Tremblant. Americans who attended the Princeton conference included Hornbeck and IPR leaders Edward Carter, William Holland, and William Lockwood. Britain’s ambassador in Washington, the renowned scholar George Sansom, New Zealand’s minister to the United States, and representatives from Canada and the Netherlands ensured that there were international voices at the gathering. Conference members debated the merits of regional and universal security organizations, arms limitation, and control of Japan’s island mandates. Attendees also discussed the treatment of Japan and its dependencies.⁷⁸

The Mont Tremblant conference in Canada centered attention on postwar cooperation between the Allies and the future of Europe’s colonies. On the American side, high-level and influential officials attended the meeting, notably Leo Pasvolsky, Undersecretary of State Adolf

A. Berle, and Lauchlin Currie, Roosevelt's economic advisor.⁷⁹ As previously mentioned, the president asked about positions Britain assumed at the conference. In addition, Currie provided Roosevelt with a written summary of the event. The conference reinforced policy networks and brought specialist attention to key issues relating to postwar East Asia. A note from Currie's correspondence reflects this. "I attended the big IPR conference" at Mont Tremblant, he wrote, and ". . . I am still full of all kinds of ideas and enthusiasms for a technical mission to China for post-war reconstruction."⁸⁰ Delegations from other nations, mindful of the U.S. failure to join the League of Nations after World War I, pressed for an American commitment to international cooperation. Referring to Roosevelt's famous "Four Freedoms" speech, one British delegate asked "What meaning is there in the words freedom from fear if the United States goes back to isolationism?" Other delegations, particularly from the United States, China, and Canada, questioned the European commitment to the principle of self-determination. Criticism targeted Britain especially, which seemed to be backing away from its agreement to the Atlantic Charter. A Chinese editorial noted that "if Britain and America will not keep to the principles which were laid down by themselves, there is no doubt that post-war world peace will not be realized."⁸¹ The point neatly summarized the criticism that dominated the Mont Tremblant conference.

Although the treatment of postwar Japan was a side-issue at the 1942 conferences, it may have had an important impact in shaping policy. While the Chinese delegation called for "Allied Asiatic troops" to briefly occupy Tokyo, thinking on postwar occupations was not yet developed in 1942.⁸² Attendees did agree that the Allies should disarm defeated Japan, and also strip it of territorial acquisitions including Korea, Manchuria, and the mandated islands. Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles shared these ideas and spoke at the IPR luncheon where the organization made the conference report public.⁸³ The Welles connection was potentially significant. In fall

1943, even after he resigned under pressure from his official position and assumed a new role as ACIPR Washington branch head, Welles remained a close confidant of Roosevelt. The two privately discussed ideas about the Cairo summit.⁸⁴ The consensus from the IPR conference, of which Welles approved, was a likely source for key agreements the Allies made at Cairo.

Plans for reconstruction and postwar policy dominated the agenda of the second wartime international conference that convened in Hot Springs, Virginia. Delegates debated issues that would determine Japan's future, specifically the treatment of the defeated nation, the status of her colonies, reparations and industry, and collective security in the Pacific region.⁸⁵ As they had in 1942, conference members agreed that the Allies should disarm Japan and strip it of overseas territories and mandates. State Department officials later cited consensus at this conference between American and foreign delegates on the question of U.S. use of Japanese bases in support of establishing “permanent [American] control” of the former mandates.⁸⁶ Fearey also informed the interdepartmental planning committee of other positions the participants took at Hot Springs, such as treatment of Japanese private property in former territories.⁸⁷ In keeping with the ideas Canadian IPR member E. H. Norman presented in a paper at the conference, the U.S. delegation advocated agrarian reform to raise peasant living standards and limiting the influence of Japan’s *zaibatsu* corporate combines.⁸⁸ During the conference, the delegates agreed that in place of a “Draconian” peace, Allied measures to pacify Japan included allowing it international trade and educating the Japanese people about democracy.⁸⁹

Connections that participants made at these conferences formed an important part of future policymaking in all Allied nations whose representatives were involved in the discussions. As one British Commonwealth delegate enthusiastically observed, “the value of international conferences of this kind is that in out-of-session discussions a number of persons from various

countries who are working in the same field get to know each other, learn from each other and are hence better equipped to work with each other in the future.”⁹⁰ Attendees could present representations of current thinking and bring new ideas from other conference participants back into the policy circles in which they worked. They also provided conference materials for government use and retention, while delegates had access to official documents from other nations that fellow participants brought to the conferences.⁹¹

Improving the resources available to government officials for establishing a long and close engagement with Asia was a major contribution of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The IPR was a leader in directing and publishing research on East Asia in the period. Government officials used the organization’s reports, pamphlets, and books for information on an unfamiliar region, and for analysis on Japan and postwar East Asia. Its publication in 1945 of Albert J. Grajdanzev’s *Modern Korea* provides an instructive example. The IPR supported the “careful research study” on a “country whose very existence [Americans] had almost forgotten” as a colony of Japan. Rather than a “quickly confected tract for the times,” it described the resources and political situation of a poorly understood territory that the Allies were about to occupy.⁹² Influential figures in policy circles circulated and read these works. The Council on Foreign Relations library requested and collected the publications of the IPR national committees, and government officials “extensively” used the New York library of the IPR. The Office of War Information regularly requested IPR publications to inform its work.⁹³ To amplify this effect, the IPR circulated special confidential reports on Japan and the Far East to American and foreign government officials. Staff members responded to “all sorts of inquiries” on the Far East.⁹⁴ In addition to carrying out and circulating research, the IPR set up and supported Asian language courses to create a supply of Japanese-language speakers to meet postwar demands.⁹⁵

Human connections between official policymakers and think-tank members were a particular strength of both the IPR and CFR during the World War II. The State Department hired WPS Project members to aid in planning, and many U.S. government officials already were council members. The Roosevelt administration also recruited IPR members into official advisory positions as the government increased its resources after 1941. In fact, so many IPR members had joined the government to meet war demand that the institute was forced to break tradition and invite U.S. officials to its conferences. In one notable case, this absorption of personnel went in the opposite direction. In September 1943, Sumner Welles became the branch head of the ACIPR in Washington. While undersecretary of state, he had been a favorite of Roosevelt and some observers even viewed him as de facto secretary of state during his tenure because of this relationship. In 1943, however, a scandal regarding his sexual activities and orientation forced him to resign.⁹⁶ Still an influential and connected figure, Welles was well placed to feed ideas from the IPR into the State Department.

Asia experts, as previously noted, were a scarce resource in Western countries in the middle of the 20th Century. Speaking of the wartime period, one famous American scholar explained, “we all knew each other in the China field in those days.”⁹⁷ Area specialists inside and outside government became acquaintances because of previous work as colleagues either in academia or public research. For example, IPR secretary William Lockwood had been a favorite graduate student of George Blakeslee, who was a council member, a founding member of the IPR, and a Far East expert at the State Department.⁹⁸ Moreover, Blakeslee founded *The Journal of International Affairs* and remained on its editorial board after it merged with the CFR journal in 1922.⁹⁹ State Department officials supported the work of the institute, attending conferences and hosting informal gatherings including members. In 1945, Joseph Grew, former ambassador

to Japan and at that time undersecretary of state, organized a cocktail evening and invited IPR conference participants. Grew asked the secretary of state to attend as well, declaring that “the Institute of Pacific Relations is an important organization and I think we should support it.”¹⁰⁰

The high-level council members working on the War and Peace Studies Project were generally well connected with government officials. Norman Davis was an obvious example. Davis, who one reporter described as “gray and graceful,”¹⁰¹ had been undersecretary of state during the Wilson administration and served as Roosevelt’s “ambassador at large” in the mid-1930s. He maintained friendly relations with senior government officials throughout his career. Davis was particularly close to Secretary of State Cordell Hull. They played croquet together and Davis regularly visited Hull at work.¹⁰² The wives of these men were also friendly and the couples planned vacations together.¹⁰³ Hull and Davis, at the request of Roosevelt, had worked together to draft the “Quarantine Speech” that the president delivered in October 1937 in response to Japanese militant expansionism igniting the war with China. Hornbeck was also on friendly terms with Davis, and sent him news articles of interest on Asia.¹⁰⁴ While the value of such links would be difficult to quantify, these networks made official cooperation with the council on the WPS Project easier than it might have been otherwise. The extent of interlinkage between the State Department and non-state actors and the fact that many key planning figures wore both hats makes it impossible to draw a clear delineation between these groups.

The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Council on Foreign Relations exerted direct and indirect influence on official postwar planning between 1937 and 1945. The CFR’s War and Peace Studies Project was the most successful wartime program. Through the project, the State Department effectively outsourced its long range planning activities to a small section of council members. As the war progressed, the U.S. government created its own planning structures, but

this remained a significant development in American policy-making. Later official wartime planning groups built on the earlier work, so that as a Rockefeller Foundation report declared, “practically everything the Council did [with the WPS Project] was meshed closely into the interests and activities of the State Department’s Advisory Committee, and the final results were a collaboration.”¹⁰⁵ After the war, Secretary of State George C. Marshall established a Policy Planning Staff that George F. Kennan famously would lead to provide the State Department with in-house long range strategic planning like what the WPS Project had offered in 1938.

The CFR’s Far East Study Group and IPR conferences influenced postwar ideas through providing officials and experts with a “thinking space” for reflection and framing debates. The impact of U.S. government outsourcing and cooperation with think tanks continued long after the war ended. Many members of the wartime Far East Study Group later grappled with the key questions debated in the council forum while actively involved in the postwar U.S. relationship with Japan. Domestic and international conferences on Pacific relations established networks and a body of careful research for the use of planners and later administrators. This established program indirectly influenced postwar planning through honing the ideas of its members. The IPR was influential in creating these plans. Moreover, it provided knowledge and networks that were useful not just in the planning phase, but also during the occupation of Japan, even as the institute itself declined. Think tank collaboration had a significant impact in determining how U.S. policy toward East Asia developed both during and immediately after World War II.

Endnotes

¹ Walter H. Mallory to Hamilton Fish Armstrong, 8 December 1941, box 2, Norman H. Davis Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

² See, for example, Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); William G. Domhoff, *The Power Elite and the State: How Policy is Made in America* (New York: A. de Gruyter, 1990); Carlo Santoro,

Diffidence and Ambition: The Intellectual Sources of U.S. Foreign Policy (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992); James A. Smith, *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of a New Policy Elite* (New York: The Free Press, 1993).

³ See Lawrence Shoup and William Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and United States Foreign Policy* (New York: Authors Choice Press, 1977); Robert D. Schulzinger, *The Wise Men of Foreign Affairs: The History of the Council on Foreign Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984); Michael Wala, *The Council on Foreign Relations and American Foreign Policy in the Early Cold War* (Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1994); Peter Grose, *Continuing the Inquiry: The Council on Foreign Relations from 1921 to 1996* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1996); Inderjeet Parmar, "Mobilizing America for An Internationalist Foreign Policy: The Role of the Council on Foreign Relations," *Studies in American Political Development* 13, no. 2 (Fall 1999): 337-73; Priscilla Roberts, "'The Council Has Been Your Creation': Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Paradigm of the American Foreign Policy Establishment," *Journal of American Studies* 35, no. 1 (April 2001): 65-94.

⁴ Yukata Sasaki, "Foreign Policy Experts as Service Intellectuals: The AIPR, the CFR and Planning the Occupation of Japan during World War Two," in *The United States and the Second World War: New Perspectives on Diplomacy, War and the Home Front*, Kurt Piehler and Sidney Pash, eds. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010): 297.

⁵ Tomoko Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific: The United States, Japan, and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace, 1919-1945* (London: Routledge, 2002); Priscilla Roberts, "Tweaking the Lion's Tail: Edgar J. Tarr, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, and the British Empire, 1931-1950," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 23, no. 4 (December 2012): 636-59; John Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974); Jon Thares Davidann, "'Colossal Illusions': U.S.-Japanese Relations in the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1919-1938," *Journal of World History* 12, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 155-82; Lawrence T. Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy: Nongovernmental Organizations and International Relations* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993).

⁶ "Editorial Statement," *Foreign Affairs* 1, no.1 (15 September 1922): 1-2.

⁷ Henry L. Stimson, secretary of war and council member, wrote scathing letters to the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in response to such invitations. Hamilton Fish Armstrong to Whitney Shepherdson, 14 June 1934, folder 19, box 57, Hamilton Fish Armstrong Papers, Seeley Mudd Library, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

⁸ This information comes from the Far East Study Group reports between 1937 and 1945, which include a list of members present, located in box 132, Council on Foreign Relations Papers, *ibid*.

⁹ See, for example, Phoebe and Kent Courtney, *America's Unelected Rulers: The Council on Foreign Relations* (New Orleans: Conservative Society of America, 1962).

¹⁰ Shoup and Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust*, p. 23.

¹¹ Leslie H. Gelb, president of the CFR, in introduction to Grose, *Continuing the Inquiry*.

¹² John K. Fairbank, "William L. Holland and the IPR in Historical Perspective," *Pacific Affairs* 52, no. 4 (Winter 1979-1980): 590.

¹³ Mahmood Ahmad, "US Think Tanks and the Politics of Expertise: Role, Value and Impact," *The Political Quarterly* 79, no. 4 (October-December 2008): 529.

¹⁴ Sasaki, "Foreign Policy Experts as Service Intellectuals," p. 297.

-
- ¹⁵ Quoted in James Cotton, "Celebrating 75 years: The Australian Institute of International Affairs and Australian International Relations," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 62, no. 4 (December 2008): 554.
- ¹⁶ John Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations*, p. 7.
- ¹⁷ Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 251.
- ¹⁸ Excerpt from Trustee Confidential Bulletin, 1 January 1940, folder 4212, box 354, Record Group [RG] 1.1 200S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Sleepy Hollow, NY.
- ¹⁹ Statement on the founding and mission of the Rockefeller Foundation, <http://m.rockfound.org/> (accessed 1 May 2012).
- ²⁰ Memorandum of Joseph H. Willits Conversation with Assistant Secretary of State George Messersmith, 11 October 1939, folder 893, box 99, Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives. The Rockefeller Foundation also supported Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) projects such as a 1938 series of studies on the "Far East situation." Institute of Pacific Relations Grant Approval, 18 February 1938, folder 4212, box 354, RG 1.1 200S, *ibid*.
- ²¹ Stanley K. Hornbeck to Robert M. Carr, 23 February 1937, box 145, Stanley K. Hornbeck Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- ²² James Thomson, Jr., "The Role of the State Department," in *Pearl Harbor as History: Japanese-American Relations, 1931-1941*, Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto, eds. (New York: Columbia University, 1973), 83. The U.S. State Department renamed the Far East Division the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs in 1966, which reported an annual budget in 2012 of \$302 million and had 1,583 employees. Just over half of the State Department's full time employees work within the United States. Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs overview, http://www.allgov.com/agency/Bureau_of_East_Asian_and_Pacific_Affairs (accessed 1 July 2012); U.S. State Department Fiscal Year 2011 Agency Financial Report, p 8, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/177397.pdf> (accessed 1 July 2012).
- ²³ Owen Lattimore, *America and Asia: Problems of Today's War and the Peace of Tomorrow* (Claremont, CA: Claremont Colleges, 1943), 33.
- ²⁴ The Course of War in China, Memoranda of Discussion, Far East Study Group, 24 January 1940, folder 8, box 132, Council on Foreign Relations Papers.
- ²⁵ China in the Postwar Asiatic World, E-F Group, 18 November 1944, folder 3, box 300, *ibid*.
- ²⁶ Lauchlin Currie to Chiang Kai-shek, 25 June 1941, box 1, Lauchlin Currie Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA
- ²⁷ Box 29, Owen Lattimore Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- ²⁸ Territorial Series Memorandum of Discussions, Thirty-second Meeting, 15 December 1942, folder 9, box 25, No. T-A 32, *ibid*.
- ²⁹ The IPR reported these changes to the Rockefeller Foundation in 1942. Memorandum on IPR Program, 4 February 1942, box 60, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- ³⁰ William Lockwood to Willits, 2 November 1942, *ibid*.
- ³¹ Council on Foreign Relations Grant Approval, 1 December 1943, folder 896, box 99, RG 1.1 Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives.

-
- ³² Trustees' Bulletin, The War and Peace Studies, 1 January 1946, *ibid*.
- ³³ Chadwick Alger introduces the term "external bureaucrats" and assesses their impact on policymaking in "The External Bureaucracy in United States Foreign Affairs," *Administrative Science Quarterly* VII, no. 1 (June 1962): 50-78.
- ³⁴ Cordell Hull to Norman H. Davis, 12 November 1940, folder 893, box 99, RG 1.1, Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives. Secretary of State Cordell Hull likely wrote this letter with the intention of its being forwarded to the Rockefeller Foundation in support of securing further financial aid for the project.
- ³⁵ Eugene Dooman to Colonel Truman Martin, 12 January 1944, box 1, Eugene Dooman Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- ³⁶ Armstrong to Davis, 4 October 1941, box 2, Davis Papers.
- ³⁷ Armstrong to Leo Pasvolosky, 12 March 1942, *ibid*.
- ³⁸ Trustees Bulletin, The War and Peace Studies, 1 January 1946, folder 896, box 99, RG 1.1, Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives.
- ³⁹ Armstrong to Davis, 19 February 1942, box 2, Davis Papers.
- ⁴⁰ Armstrong to Isaiah Bowman, 26 March 1942, folder 2, box 12, Armstrong Papers.
- ⁴¹ Bowman to Willits, 23 November 1943, folder 896, box 99, RG 1.1 Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives.
- ⁴² Alternatives of United States Policy in the Western Pacific (Preliminary Memorandum First Draft), Territorial Group, 5 October 1940, folder 9, box 25, Lattimore Papers.
- ⁴³ Post War United States-Philippine Relations (preliminary draft), Territorial Group, 18 August 1942, folder 3, box 299, Council on Foreign Relations Papers.
- ⁴⁴ Digest of Discussion, T-A25, 1942:9, in Domhoff, *The Power Elite and the State*, p. 138.
- ⁴⁵ Territorial Series, Memorandum of Discussions, Twenty-third Meeting, 18 March 1942, folder 9, box 25, Lattimore Papers.
- ⁴⁶ The Regional Organization of Security (discussion draft), Armaments Group, 4 April 1944, folder 2, box 300, Council on Foreign Relations Papers.
- ⁴⁷ Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy*, p. 26.
- ⁴⁸ Council on Foreign Relations Grant Approval, 2 December 1942, folder 896, box 99, RG 1.1 Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives.
- ⁴⁹ Japan's Peace Terms, Fourth Meeting, Do Bases for a Real Peace Exist Between the United States and Japan?, 3 March 1942, U.S. in the Far East Series, box 1, 1940-1948, Royal Institute for International Affairs Far East Department Papers, School of Oriental and African Studies Archives, University of London, London, UK.
- ⁵⁰ Discussion of Neutrality, Trade, and Defense, Far East Study Group, 14 March 1939, folder 7, box 131, Council on Foreign Relations Papers.

-
- ⁵¹ Shoup and Minter, *Imperial Brain Trust*, pp. 141-42.
- ⁵² Study Group Digest of Discussion, Japan's Peace Terms, Second Meeting, Do Bases for a Real Peace Exist Between the United States and Japan?, 26 November 1941, U.S. in the Far East Series, box 1, 1940-1948, Royal Institute for International Affairs Far East Department Papers.
- ⁵³ The Treatment of Defeated Japan, Chinese-American Study Group, 13 April 1944, box 134, Hornbeck Papers.
- ⁵⁴ Our Future Trade Relations with Japan, Far East Study Group, 17 April 1940, folder 8, box 132, Council on Foreign Relations Papers.
- ⁵⁵ The Course of War in China, Far East Group, 24 January 1940, *ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ Our Future Trade Relations with Japan, Far East Study Group, 17 April 1940.
- ⁵⁷ Discussion of Neutrality, Trade, and Defense, Far East Study Group, March 14 1939.
- ⁵⁸ Study Group Digest of Discussion, Japan's Peace Terms, Fourth Meeting, Do Bases for a Real Peace Exist Between the United States and Japan?, 3 March 1942, US in the Far East Series, box 1, 1940-1948, Royal Institute for International Affairs Far East Department Papers.
- ⁵⁹ The Treatment of Defeated Japan, Chinese-American Study Group, 13 April 1944.
- ⁶⁰ Study Group Digest of Discussion, Concrete Issues in a Post-War Settlement with Japan, Sixth Meeting, Do Bases for a Real Peace Exist Between the United States and Japan?, 7 April 1942, US in the Far East Series, box 1, 1940-1948, Royal Institute for International Affairs Far East Department Papers.
- ⁶¹ Lawrence T. Woods, "Learning from NGO Proponents of Asia-Pacific Regionalism: Success and Its Lessons," *Asian Survey* 35, no. 9 (September 1995): 813.
- ⁶² For example, the British Chatham House group sent a report on reform and the treatment of postwar Japan to a meeting of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations (ACIPR) in January 1944. Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 261.
- ⁶³ These are the December 1942 Mont Tremblant, Canada and January 1945 Hot Springs, Virginia Conferences. Because discussion records are not available, researchers must rely for information about the content of these conferences on conference agendas, media coverage, IPR published summaries, and delegate reports provides.
- ⁶⁴ Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy*, p. 32.
- ⁶⁵ 2-B-168 IDAFE Meeting No. 187, 8 February 1945, in Makoto Iokibe (ed.), *The Occupation of Japan [microform]: U.S. Planning Documents, 1942-1945* (Tokyo: Maruzen, 1987).
- ⁶⁶ Quoted in Roger Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy, Britain, the United States and Japan 1945-1952* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 9.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 201.
- ⁶⁸ Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 261; Sasaki, "Foreign Policy Experts As Service Intellectuals," p. 299.

⁶⁹ These issues arise repeatedly in the collected notes and published reports on the first wartime IPR conference, which took place in 1942. *War and Peace in the Pacific: A Preliminary Report on the Eighth Conference IPR Mont Tremblant 1942* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943).

⁷⁰ Australia different line: Report of Meeting, Study Group on Post-War International Organisation [sic], Reconstruction Studies, Australian Institute of International Affairs, 174, 25 June 1942, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers.

⁷¹ Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, pp. 186-87.

⁷² Minister of External Affairs Herbert Evatt, "Evatt Charges Britain is Denying Australia a Place in Peace Talks," *The Evening Star*, 24 August 1945.

⁷³ Memorandum from Paul Hasluck to Minister of External Affairs, 15 January 1943, Series A989, 1943/650/1 Part 2, National Archives of Australia, Canberra, Australia.

⁷⁴ C. Hartley Grattan, "British Commonwealth Conference," *Far Eastern Survey* 13, no. 12 (June 1944): 112.

⁷⁵ Christopher Thorne, *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain, and the War Against Japan, 1941-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 132.

⁷⁶ For example, see 2-A-102 Japan: United States: Disposition of the Mandated Islands, CAC-335 prelim, 26 January 1945 and 2-B-168 IDAFE Meeting No. 187, 8 February 1945, Iokibe, *The Occupation of Japan [microform]: U.S. Planning Documents, 1942-1945*, p.

⁷⁷ Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, pp. 258, 262.

⁷⁸ Draft Agenda, Wartime and Postwar Cooperation of the United Nations in the Far East, IPR Conference, 9 June 1942, box 63, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers; Plan of Meetings and Revised Agenda, 4 December 1942, box 467, *ibid.*

⁷⁹ The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC), responsible for U.S. policy on Japan, grew out of Leo Pasvolsky's Division of Special Research. Lauchlin Currie was a passionate China-hand who used his position to pass favorable reports and articles on China to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

⁸⁰ Currie to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 18 December 1942, box 5, Currie Papers; Currie to John Carter Vincent, 4 January 1943, box 1, *ibid.*

⁸¹ These quotes are located in a translated summary of "On the Report of the Institute of Pacific Relations," *Ta Kung Pao [Independent]*, 9 April 1943, which circulated in the Australian Department of External Relations as indicative of Chinese views on postwar planning. Series A989, 1943/650/1 Part 2, National Archives of Australia.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ "Welles for Force to Maintain Peace" *New York Times*, 8 April 1943.

⁸⁴ Xiaoyuan Liu, *A Partnership for Disorder: China, the United States, and their Policies for the Postwar Disposition of the Japanese Empire, 1941-1945* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 122.

⁸⁵ William C. Johnstone, "The Hot Springs Conference," *Far Eastern Survey* 14, no. 2 (January 1945): 16.

⁸⁶ 2-A-102 Japan: United States: Disposition of the Mandated Islands, CAC-335 prelim, 26 January 1945, in Iokibe, *The Occupation of Japan [microform]: US Planning Documents, 1942-1945*, p.

⁸⁷ 2-B-168 IDAFE Meeting No. 187, 8 February 1945, *ibid.*.

⁸⁸ The IPR later published the paper E.H. Norman presented titled "Feudal Background of Japanese Politics" as Secretariat Paper No. 9 (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1945).

⁸⁹ Sir Frederick Whyte, "When Japan is Beaten" *The Times* [Australia], 13 February 1945 and "Japanese Ruler Must Lose His Autocracy" *Observer* [Australia], 28 January 1945.

⁹⁰ Quoted from Paul Hasluck, *Diplomatic Witness: Australian Foreign Affairs, 1941-1947* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1980), 71, in Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy*, pp. 32-33.

⁹¹ Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, pp. 258, 270.

⁹² Meribeth Cameron "Korea and the Future," *New York Times*, 27 May 1945.

⁹³ Ruth Savord to IPR, 10 December 1941, box 48, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers. There are numerous Office of War Information requests for microfilm copies of IPR reports in box 73, *ibid.*

⁹⁴ The ACIPR included examples of resource sharing in an appeal to the Rockefeller Foundation for additional funds. William Lockwood to Willits, 2 November 1942, box 60, *ibid.*

⁹⁵ Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 256.

⁹⁶ Woods, *Asia-Pacific Diplomacy*, p. 32; Akami, *Internationalizing the Pacific*, p. 253. See also, chapter 8 in Christopher O'Sullivan *Sumner Welles, Postwar Planning, and the Quest for a New World Order, 1937-1943* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003).

⁹⁷ Fairbank, "William L. Holland and the IPR in Historical Perspective," p. 589.

⁹⁸ George Blakeslee to Armstrong, n.d. MC002, folder 17, Correspondence 1942, box 74, Armstrong Papers.

⁹⁹ Biographical Note, George H Blakeslee Papers, Clark University Archives and Special Collections, www.clarku.edu/research/archives/blakeslee/bio_note.cfm (accessed 1 May 2012).

¹⁰⁰ Joseph C. Grew to Edward R. Stettinius, 5 January 1945, MS am 1687 (123), Joseph C. Grew Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

¹⁰¹ "War in China," *Time*, 15 November 1937.

¹⁰² Domhoff, *The Power Elite and the State*, p. 116.

¹⁰³ There are many letters between the four located in the Hull Folder, box 27, Davis Papers.

¹⁰⁴ Wayne S. Cole, *Roosevelt and the Isolationists, 1932-1945* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 244; Box 139, Hornbeck Papers.

¹⁰⁵ Trustees' Bulletin, The War and Peace Studies, 1 January 1946, folder 896, box 99, RG 1.1 Series 100S, Rockefeller Foundation Archives.