

CBF

December 3, 1946

DHS

900  
P+P  
Area Studies

copy filed  
911  
P+P  
Cultures, national  
+ international

### Brief on Language and Area Studies in the U.S.

I should summarize tentative conclusions on the principles we should apply as follows:

1. Language is for use. Instruction is an obvious prerequisite but if the student does not become habituated to using the language in college the instruction is likely to be wasted. The R.F. should not aid foreign language instruction at any institution which does not have an integrated program of foreign language use.

2. It is impossible at the college level to predict whether and where a student will go abroad. The need of the business man, diplomat, or traveller for speaking command not associated with area study can be best met by practical programs of instruction such as the American Russian Institute, the Department of State, the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, Linguaphone, and Berlitz offer. R.F. need not assist except possibly to secure implementation on unusual languages. Even here government support is preferable.

3. Provision for use of language for scientific purposes other than area studies requires only a minimum of initiative on the part of professors and libraries. Since there is inertia, we might help someone who took the problem seriously but we should not spend much.

4. The integration of language with area studies, on the other hand, requires intensive language work, additional staff in various disciplines, large libraries, and major curriculum revision. Here major help is needed and should be provided.

5. We should attempt to stimulate minimum essential coverage for all areas of the world. The minimum will of course depend on the importance of the area.

6. It is desirable to have area studies in both colleges and universities, therefore pioneering in both should be aided.

7. When the minimum has been established on a sound basis R.F. should withdraw. It is our job to help someone start the band wagon. We have no responsibility to help the late comers to climb on.



8. An area program in depth (the only kind we should be interested in) is expensive. It is likely to be put on a sound and permanent footing only if the sponsoring institution specializes. An area program is a focus for the various social science and humanistic disciplines. It is not itself a discipline. Reasonably full coverage of the disciplines is desirable but two foci are all that are needed - one on a domestic area for a base and one on a foreign area for comparison. More may be confusing as well as costly. Healthy development of the American educational system, encouragement of intellectual discussion, and equitable use of R.F. funds all suggest that centers of area studies should be widely spread. The R.F. on principle should not support more than one foreign area program at one institution. It should query the need for outside assistance to any institution which itself undertakes more than one. An area must be small enough to serve as a focus.

9. As soon as study centers for a given area are well established here the R.F. should move into development of centers overseas and the cultivation of international relations.

If we apply these principles to some of our current problems what are the results?

#### Russian studies

The Columbia Russian Institute is outstanding (except perhaps language instruction?) and assistance should be continued although Columbia should take over as soon as possible.

Stanford is the next best bet. Pressure should be exerted to secure integration between the Hoover Library and the University. The Far East program should perhaps be pruned to give the USSR program more life.

At least four more strong university centers are a minimum and should be developed as fast as men are available but the other claimants are still only fiddling. It is possible that centers in the Plains area, in the South and in Alaska would add important special interests.

At least two good college programs should be encouraged.

#### Far East

What is needed most is consolidation and strengthening of existing centers.

Harvard, because of the Harvard-Yenching Foundation, is a natural for both Chinese and Japanese studies but needs little help if it will stop trying to do everything else, too.

Yale has the beginning of a first-class center on Chinese but also needs to avoid competing programs and to define objectives. Further help should probably emphasize integration of language with disciplines.

Univ. of Washington is best on Modern China and may be able to swing Japan, too. I don't know. Further help probably in order.

California, Chicago, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Colorado and Michigan are all question marks but with Chicago most promising. Desirability of additional aid is questionable unless objectives and programs are much more clearly defined.



One additional strong center for Japanese studies should be found, and one of the existing centers should add Korea.

At least one good college program on the Far East should be encouraged. Pomona? but only if area objectives are more clearly delimited and narrowed.

On Far East we are ready to encourage more internationalization; help to England, perhaps Canada and Australia; fellowships for non-Americans; exchange of personnel with Far East.

#### Arabic studies

Two strong centers needed; none now in existence.

Princeton and Chicago are both possibilities but neither has modern interest or has decided on field of specialization. If Princeton should decide on Near East quid pro quo for help should be transfer of Guest Library to a center of Chinese studies, perhaps Yale. Most interest is now being shown in Washington, D.C. but the Institute of Advanced International Studies is not yet on a sound long-run foundation.

R.F. should work on fellowships for a few good students now, hope to develop centers later.

#### Indic studies

One or two strong centers needed, none now in existence.

Pennsylvania and Yale are possibilities but Yale should stick to Chinese, and Pennsylvania is riding four horses - Far East, India, Near East, and Africa.

R.F. should work on fellowships now; hope to develop centers later.

#### African studies (south of Sahara)

Two strong centers needed, one preferably in a Negro university. None now in existence. This is a long-range task which will have to start with exploration and trial fellowships. Africa will be critical within 20 to 50 years and we should be prepared.

#### Southeast Asia (Philippines, French Indo-China, Siam, Burma, Malaya, Netherlands East Indies)

One center needed, none now in existence. Luke-warm interest at Harvard, Yale, and Stanford, none of which should be encouraged because of priority other programs.

Development requires fellowships, use of training facilities in Europe, study and research in area, and eventually aid to native scholarship in the area. A long-run job but one which may have great cultural and political significance.

#### Traditional Areas

We do not need more courses on the British Isles, Germany, France, Italy, and Latin America but we urgently need an integrated approach to those areas. We should be ready to encourage a pioneer effort at either the university or the college level for any one of them.

#### Other Areas

Due for some consideration are: Caribbean studies (a Negro university?); Canadian studies; Scandinavian studies (Minnesota or North Dakota?); Finno-Ugric (Indiana?); Balkan studies; Baltic and East European; Oceanic (Hawaii?); the Iberian Peninsula; Australasia.



discussion as opportunity offers of the area study problem and watchful waiting for indications of institutional initiative. However, the bearing of other humanities grants - eg. in literature - on the possible development of an area approach should be kept in mind.

#### Canada, Australia, New Zealand

These countries offer interesting study possibilities for the less wealthy institutions, are almost entirely neglected (except for the Carnegie Endowment sponsored program of studies on Canada), and are of very great importance for American international relations. No program is presently contemplated but we should be alert to possibilities. The opportunity is probably greater in social sciences than in humanities.

#### Latin America

Present attention is adequate in volume but poorly organized. More thorough programs at fewer institutions more clearly giving priority to Latin America and specializing on a single manageable part of that continent would give more significant results. This is a very good possibility for college as well as university programs. Humanities should help but only if a good opportunity to support better programming is found.

#### The Caribbean

American attention to this area is badly needed from a national policy point of view and would be rewarding educationally. The Caribbean and Africa south of the Sahara are the two areas perhaps of greatest special interest for negro institutions and the negro scholar Ralph Bunche (State Department and U.N.), who was for some time secretary of the Caribbean Commission, would be an ideal director. However, the only active institutional interest known is at the University of Georgia. Exploitation is indicated but no early action by Humanities is contemplated.

#### Near East and North Africa

Humanities has aided Princeton recently but Princeton has not yet defined a program of specialization. The Institute of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D. C., may prove more important. Because of its significance for history, religion, philosophy, and literature and its linguistic complexities this area calls for increased Humanities support. However, the great importance of the area in several widely separated historical periods and the tie-up between language studies and religion creates unusual problems in setting up effective area programs. Humanities needs



to discuss these problems further with such people as Hitti, Arthur L. Wright, and John A. Wilson; probably to give fellowship aid to some of the students of Arabic developed during the war; and to work out more concrete projects at a later date.

#### Africa South of the Sahara

Africa is likely to become a critical international issue within twenty to fifty years if not before. Two strong centers of study in the United States would seem to be in order, one preferably in a Negro university. However, the problem seems to be primarily one for Social Sciences. Humanities proposes no action. The question of African studies at Leiden should also be left to Social Sciences. The Carnegie Corporation may aid African studies at Pennsylvania.

#### India

Indic studies are of importance for almost every branch of the Humanities and their development in America increases in urgency with India's progress towards independence. However, the Sanskrit scholars have not shown much breadth and the institutions now interested in Indic studies all have many other area interests which seem to have priority in their programs. Training fellowships are in order if suitable candidates can be found. It is premature to think of centers.

#### China, Japan, Korea

This is the area of longest Humanities interest. What is needed most in the United States is consolidation and strengthening of existing centers. Harvard, because of the Harvard-Yenching Foundation, should retain a leading position in Chinese studies and is now strong in Japanese as well. Harvard needs little help. Yale, Washington, and California are the next best possibilities and expect Rockefeller Foundation help. Such help should be favorably considered by Humanities but with increasing insistence on the integration of language and subject work and clear definition by the institutions concerned of specialization and priority. The Wittfogel project should probably be tied in with one of these programs if continued. Japan and Korea are not yet adequately provided for although Japanese studies are supported as an adjunct to Chinese studies at a number of institutions and work on Korea has been begun at California. Maintenance of a model college program is important and Pomona offers the most promise if the purpose and role of Far Eastern studies there can be more clearly defined.

Humanities can now with profit emphasize developments elsewhere - eg. in Great Britain, France, Holland, Sweden, China, and Japan and choose for assistance, where possible, programs which involve international exchanges.



Southeast Asia (The Philippines, Netherlands East Indies, Indonesia, Malaya, French Indo-China, Siam, and Burma)

This area is one which the United States should not continue to neglect, one on which European studies are suspect and incomplete, and one which has very limited indigenous scholarship. At least one center in the United States is needed. There is luke-warm interest at Harvard, Yale and Stanford but all are questionable because of the priority of other programs. The Carnegie Corporation may back Yale.

Probably any large program is premature. One could be staffed only by attracting personnel from the Department of State. The first step is fellowship aid with candidates to be sought from among the wartime trainees in Malay, Siamese, Burmese, and Annamese. Fellows should work here and in Europe. Later, when conditions permit, they should work in Southeast Asia and a program of development of native scholarship there should be begun. This is a long-run job but one which may have great cultural and political significance.

Pacific Islands

Work in this area is of greater significance for social sciences than for humanities. Moreover, the programs of the War Memorial Foundation and the Navy seem likely to leave little that needs urgent aid. The question of work on the Pacific Islands must be kept in mind, however, in any consideration of a program of area specialization at the University of Hawaii or in Australia and New Zealand.

Arctic

The Institute of Arctic Studies at Toronto apparently emphasizes natural and applied sciences. Humanities has given some help to linguistic and archaeological studies but probably will not give high priority to any large program.

*Montreal?*

The United States

Area studies as outlined above imply an extensive program of regional American studies at each institution giving foreign area studies and participation by the same students in both. Such an arrangement would help to integrate the studies of regional history, literature, and folklore which Humanities has heretofore aided and is also consistent with recently expressed interests of the Trustees. Humanities cannot well support American studies at all institutions but should seek one or more opportunities to encourage an integrated program of this type in the hope that, if successful, it will be

widely copied. Where to try such an experiment can be discovered only by wide discussion of the problem of area studies at various institutions as opportunities occur in the course of Humanities work.

*Charles B. Felt*