

900
Q10
Area-2
cop 1

Widening Our Cultural Horizons

by

Charles Burton Fahs

November 12, 1954

WIDENING OUR CULTURAL HORIZONS

When the General Education Board and The Rockefeller Foundation first began encouragement of scholarship on "unusual" areas it was a declaration of faith in the need for scholarship in the United States to take into account the significant products of the human spirit without regard for traditional cultural boundaries. Since that time a major war has catapulted the United States to world leadership and made more urgent our need for competence in the understanding of peoples of all countries. Meanwhile The Rockefeller Foundation's efforts to contribute in this field within the American educational system have encountered many problems and led to an exploration of a variety of ways of realizing that early statement of faith. Work on "unusual" areas would have remained sterile had it not impinged increasingly on other concerns of the Foundation in the Humanities and the Social Sciences. Consequently there are an increasing number of cases where grants can be classified under more than one program purpose. There has been controversy over both goals and methods. While there is a considerable measure of agreement among foundation officers, not only within The Rockefeller Foundation, but also the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, it would be difficult to secure complete agreement on any statement as detailed as that attempted here. Since a full statement seems desirable as a basis for discussion by The Rockefeller Foundation trustees this one has been prepared as a deliberately personal statement of how the problem looks to the Director of the Division of Humanities.

I would now define the problem as that of expanding our education, our research, and our intellectual grasp to meet the needs of the shrunken and interdependent world of the second half of the twentieth century. There are several reasons why this is necessary. Most obvious is the political or even military need to have within our country resources in scholars, libraries, and training facilities to strengthen our national capacity for sound foreign policy. While government research (such as takes place in the Department of State, the CIA, and the Rand Corporation) and training programs (such as the Army language training school at Monterey) are essential, we assume that under the American system of government it is also necessary to have strong facilities in universities or other institutions independent of Federal control. In a somewhat deeper sense, however, the strong development of scholarship on all parts of the world is essential to good U. S. relations abroad. No amount of government effort and expenditure through USIA will create good cultural relations where real knowledge and genuine interest does not exist among American leaders in cultural affairs, particularly in the universities. In a still deeper sense the objective is the enrichment of our own culture through the incorporation of what can be learned from the best of human thought and creative work throughout the world.

The complexity and magnitude of the problem should not be underestimated. What is required is the restructuring of intellectual and research concerns on an unprecedented scale. While interest in Arabic studies in England goes back to Roger Bacon (he was accused of being pro-Saracen), upon the whole the geographic expansion of scholarly interests has come late; e.g. Byzantine and American studies came to importance only in the twentieth century.

We still look back narrowly down the road which we assume our intellectual ancestors followed as if our view were constricted by blinders. General education courses as yet cover only the history of western civilization and even then give scant attention to Byzantium, Eastern Europe or Scandinavia. Books under general titles such as "history of education," "history of political theory," or "history of the novel" are still published without reference to anything outside the western tradition, without apology for the omission, and in some cases without apparent realization that any omission has been made. Despite progress over twenty years the blinders are still worn all too frequently.

Of course in one sense our heritage is peculiarly western. The institutions, practises and values of our democratic society are the product of a long evolution and we ignore their history and origins only at our peril. But in another sense in this nuclear and air age our heritage is the whole of human culture. If we wish to build the culture of the future rather than merely to admire our umbilical cord we must make world culture our own.

Much progress has been made in twenty years. It is encouraging, therefore, that as late as 1930 the president of one of our major universities was quoted as saying that Chinese was not acceptable in meeting language requirements because its study could not be expected to contribute the mental discipline which came from studying Greek and Latin. The Modern Language Association is now urging the need for adequate attention to languages other than those of Europe. On China and Japan we have many important libraries and art collections, and students in these fields are no longer considered mildly insane. But although the blinders are being removed their effects will persist for a long time. The great expansion of our educational institutions and the crystallization of our present curriculum patterns came during a period of almost exclusive western orientation. Even the fairly recent general education programs have been preoccupied with the western aspects of our heritage. Professors for entirely honest reasons tend to train their graduate students along the lines they themselves know best, and so the western orientation is projected in the new generation of scholars. Even if this were not the case the educational problems of the era now upon us could not be met merely by adding new staff, new courses, or new institutes to the existing structure. The blinders had the advantage of permitting intensive cultivation of a relatively narrow field of scholarship. It is not simple to expand the scope of attention and yet to maintain the intellectual quality of instruction and research. Nor can students be expected merely to add new courses to those they already take. Presumably the next few years must bring a rethinking of curricula in ways which cannot now be foreseen.

Programs of Graduate Research and Training

The earliest RF action was directed toward the training of individual scholars in Chinese, Japanese, and Russian studies. Language training programs and summer institutes were supported and fellowships were given for foreign study. As the students thus helped began to come back from their work overseas the Foundation often was instrumental in helping them find academic

posts and, where appropriate, gave grants to universities or colleges to create new positions. Such grants were normally given with the understanding that the receiving institution would continue the position (although not necessarily the individual scholar) after termination of Foundation aid. Although Foundation initiative came from the Humanities, it was understood that the purpose was to train personnel in both humanities and social sciences. This was a fortunate break from the traditional language-literature-history emphasis which is partly responsible for the shortcomings of present Latin American offerings in U. S. institutions and for the little our long emphasis on French, Spanish and German languages has accomplished in creating any comparable broad understanding of contemporary France, Spain, and Germany.

The inclusion of social scientists among those encouraged in Far Eastern and Russian studies had another result. While a scholar in language might be content with a program of instruction in language and literature, the political scientist or economist working on Japan or China felt the need of a more rounded program. He could not depend, as his colleagues working on Europe might, on the general cultural background of his students and on the language instruction normally provided in a university. Without outside help he was condemned either to spend much of his own time on instruction in language and general historical and cultural background or to have only students quite unprepared to understand his work in politics and economics. Thus there arose the concept of association in a university program of a team of scholars on a given foreign area which included teachers of language, humanities and social sciences. This concept was re-enforced by experience with the Army "language and area" study programs during the war and by the experience of scholars who worked in wartime government research agencies.

Since the war the concept of "area studies" thus evolved has been debated at length and a substantial body of dogma has resulted. One report prepared for the Social Science Research Council (under a Carnegie Corporation grant) proposed that no university should be recognized as having an "area program" unless at least five separate disciplines were represented on the staff. Even if this doctrine is accepted, however, there is debate as to whether the mere existence on the staff of five scholars in different departments working on one area is sufficient, or whether their work must be integrated in some way through a special institute or department, through a jointly planned course of study, or through a cooperative program of research. There is also debate as to the desirability of undergraduate majors on an area, or of graduate degrees in areas rather than disciplines, although at the graduate level most of the scholars now agree that it is desirable that the degree itself be in one of the recognized disciplines such as history, economics, or political science with specialization on a given area. This latter preference is largely a practical one since it makes it easier for the young Ph.D. to find a job within present university and college structures. In any case the phrase "area studies" has become so involved with arguments of this character that its use in discussion frequently creates confusion.

The Rockefeller Foundation has not been and need not be limited by these various dogmas. We have as a matter of fact supported a great variety of programs. We have supported individual scholars in small colleges like Pomona and larger teams as at the Far Eastern Institute at Columbia. We have helped the Russian Institute at Columbia where the entire emphasis is on graduate training and research, and the Far Eastern program at Stanford where most of the effort was at an undergraduate area. The University of Washington had help in connection with a highly organized cooperative study of the Taiping rebellion, but we have also given research grants for independent work by individual scholars or for research at centers where research is individual in character.

In addition to the general objectives outlined above we have felt that language knowledge is a prerequisite for competence on a foreign culture and we have favored interrelationships between the humanities and the social sciences. For reasons outlined more fully below we have sought to encourage continuity and concentration of effort within individual institutions and division of labor among them. Otherwise, however, we have assumed that wide experimentation was necessary and desirable.

How adequately is the national need now being met after twenty years of RF activity? The answer depends on whether one is concerned chiefly with what is desirable in the national interest, or with effective demand and whether the emphasis is on general cultural or more specifically political objectives. From the points of view of both cultural enrichment and political effectiveness it is desirable that within the U.S. system of higher education there be some continuing attention to each culture of any substantial importance in the world. One can construct various priority lists. From a strategic point of view Russian studies must be near the top in importance but Russian studies are already widespread so that additional programs are of doubtful urgency. Of existing gaps perhaps studies of India-Pakistan and of Africa are most important. But the establishment of one center for work on a relatively minor area - e.g. Korea or Afghanistan may be more urgent than the establishment of an additional center in a field in which we are already strong - e.g. Russia or Japan. From a purely cultural point of view additional work on India-Pakistan would probably head the priority list, while additional work on the Near East, Southeast Asia, or even Scandinavia might well displace Africa in second place. Latin American studies provide a discouraging example of numerically ample programs and scholars, combined with low quality of output and distressingly poor coverage of any single Latin American country. In my opinion this is largely the result of two factors: excessive domination of the field by language, literature and history and failure on the part of the universities interested in Latin America to work out a division of labor encouraging more intensive work on limited parts of a very large area. The RF has not recently been active in Latin American studies: a foundation cannot secure desirable developments merely by willingness to make appropriations. We are dependent to a considerable degree on the readiness of scholars and institutions to move in constructive directions. On the whole, from the point of view of major centers of research and graduate training the United States is relatively well off on the USSR, China, and Japan. We have good but inadequate programs on Southeast Asia and the Near East. India-Pakistan and

Africa are neglected. Latin America is adequately covered in terms of numbers but not in terms of quality. As soon as one turns to smaller units - Korea, the Philippines, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan - coverage is poor or nonexistent. From the point of view of the general training of university graduates, however, we have hardly as yet scratched the surface - the overwhelming majority of our students still graduate without effective contact with any culture outside the west.

How solid is the development which has been achieved? Can we safely move on to try to fill the remaining gaps? The officers have been in close touch with programs of this sort around the country ever since the inception of RF aid. However, during the last few months a special effort has been made to take a fresh look at some of the more important centers. One inescapable conclusion is that not all of the considerable number of programs which the RF has assisted are now both academically effective and able to continue their development without constant transfusions of foundation money. The original assumption that programs temporarily supported by the Foundation could and would later be carried by the universities unaided has proven valid only in part. Some of the difficulty is administrative and academic. A number of the cases of weakness appear due to failure of executive leadership in the universities - too many divergent vested interests have been encouraged and then left to shift for themselves in competition for inadequate funds. Part of the difficulty is due to failure to establish for work on the unusual areas adequate undergraduate functions which can justify a larger share in tuition revenue, general income, or state appropriations. (Possible undergraduate uses are discussed more fully later.) But a significant part of the difficulty remains financial - except in the state universities there are few sources of support for work on the unusual areas except foundations. The development of area studies has coincided in time with the development of increased university dependence on current giving. "Hard-money" income from which the universities would have to meet any long-term commitment is now relatively less adequate than it was when the programs were undertaken.

But the fact that some of the programs have proven less successful than was originally hoped is no reason for abandoning the original purposes and methods. The problem of an undergraduate base is being slowly solved. The officers have constantly pressed for more long-range university and college planning for limited commitments within institutions and for the division of labor among them. We feel that the present situation confirms our policy in this regard. Nevertheless, if we wish to reduce the necessity for small-scale and short-term Foundation support and at the same time to improve quality and completeness of coverage it will be necessary to put long-term capital into a few programs. I feel that this is justifiable only where we have an existing interest through past support (since the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation are also active we need not accept sole responsibility for the entire field), and where the institution concerned gives evidence of its own firm intentions to maintain standards and continuity of work on a well-defined area. Where these circumstances exist, however, we think that modest long-term capital will provide much-needed stability and continuity and that it is not desirable to keep institutions and professors on the leading strings which are implied in heavy dependence on small-scale and short-term foundation help.

There have been some reports of over-production of Ph.D.s in Chinese, Japanese, and recently even Russian studies. On this too we have made inquiries. I am convinced that the situation is not serious although some difficulty has been created by the fact that during the last year or so the flow of area trained personnel has been away from government rather than to it. Obviously, graduate training programs cannot live purely to train replacements for their own staffs and this raises questions as yet not answered as to the possibility of more extensive utilization of personnel in nonspecialized undergraduate instruction. Moreover, while immediate strategic and operational needs can perhaps be met by graduate programs, the more basic cultural objectives can be achieved only by changes in undergraduate education.

Undergraduate Uses

There are three principal undergraduate uses for instruction on the unusual areas: major sequences whether departmental or interdepartmental, general education, and enrichment of offerings in other departments.

A number of the major universities now have departments of Far Eastern or other area studies in which a student can major as an undergraduate. In some cases, e.g. the University of Washington, enrollments are quite large, and this undergraduate instruction provides a substantial justification for maintenance of a sizable staff from the general university budget. It is arguable that a major of this sort can provide a genuine liberal education suitable to any general postgraduation career. The "greats" program in classics at Oxford is in an area major on Greece and Rome. No major program on Asia or the USSR with which we are familiar approaches this degree of intellectual quality, however. "Greats" at Oxford presupposes a school education in Latin and Greek and a long tradition of classical scholarship on which both professor and student can learn. It will be many years before anything comparable is possible on Japan or China. In the meantime the usual justification for undergraduate area majors is as professional training either for work in the field or for more advanced study. This justification is a dubious one - the opportunities for specialized employment are too few to justify substantial student enrollments.

Interdepartmental majors are typical of institutions which have several professors in various departments specializing on a given area but do not wish to set up a special department or institute. A few students under the guidance of a designated professor or committee are permitted to construct a major concentration from courses in various departments having the area in common or bearing some relation to its problems. Such major sequences are also fairly common now in the United States.

It is possible also to imagine intensive work on a single foreign area as a part of required general education - i.e. not in lieu of a professional major but in addition to it. From the point of view of turning out a generation of American graduates better able to understand other nations this would be one of the most promising developments. As far as we know it has been tried only partially at two places. Colgate requires

all sophomores as part of their core program to take one year of work on a foreign area and offers four or five areas from which they may choose. Occidental College, with RF help, has been building work on the American Southwest and the Mexican Northwest into its general education sequence on western civilization.

Finally, it is possible without the addition of any special department or program to enrich the work of the usual disciplines such as philosophy, political science, anthropology, or religion by introducing additional material on the more unusual foreign areas. This may happen, for example, when a young Ph.D. in political science who happens to have done special work on Japan is hired as an instructor and in addition to the usual work on American government is permitted either to offer a more advanced course on Japanese government or to include lectures on Japan in the course in comparative government. The possibility of this kind of appointment when no more specialized one is available is the principal reason why most of the graduate professors specializing on the unusual areas now prefer that their students take the Ph.D. in one of recognized discipline rather than in area work alone.

It is on the further development of these undergraduate uses of instruction on the unusual areas that the employment of the Ph.D.s from the graduate programs depends. It is in what I have here called "enrichment" that the prospects during the next few years appear most promising. A substantial number of appointments are being made at smaller colleges or at institutions not generally thought to be concerned with work on the unusual areas - appointments at Bennington and Sarah Lawrence of two anthropologists trained at the Southeast Asia program at Cornell are examples. Such men no doubt provide the leaven without which the necessary general rethinking of curricula will not take place. In the meantime, however, the development is a haphazard one. Such appointments offer little assurance of continuity in area interest at one institution and therefore little justification for library development. They provide very limited opportunities for the scholar to maintain the special area competence for which he was trained. With most of these individual cases the Foundation cannot be concerned but some consideration may be needed of techniques to maintain and develop the competences of a few of the best men in these relatively isolated positions. Refresher years overseas or at the major research and library centers have been suggested. A brief survey of the present situation in a number of the usual academic disciplines will give some idea of the opportunities for the introduction of new materials from outside the western tradition.

Broadening the Scope of the Disciplines

It should be clear that the addition of special "area" research and training programs is not the only way in which we can broaden our intellectual horizons. It is also possible to inject new material or ideas from Asia or Africa into courses in general philosophy, literature, or government. We consider both approaches valid and necessary but there is some point to trying to clarify the relative functions of each. This is a matter which, in the form of debates over the desirability of area majors, has created much controversy in the universities but which has not been thoroughly analyzed. The problem has

been obscured by the fact that most of our traditional courses are neither the one nor the other. They purport to be analytical disciplines universally applicable to human experience, when in fact they are culture bound. The traditional scholar in the university does not understand why it is necessary to have an "area study" on India because he does not realize that the whole of our humanistic and social science education has been an area study of Europe (after all, India alone is about as complicated culturally as the whole of Europe). He assumes that the university can gradually add courses on Japanese and Indian history much as they added ones on Italy or Spain a few years ago and that a course on Chinese economics is unnecessary, for isn't the science of economics universal? He imagines vaguely that as this process of addition of courses continues the university with its present departmental structure will meet adequately our needs for world coverage. If in this direction he foresees mental indigestion - as I certainly do - his reaction is to reject study of the unusual areas.

The answer seems to me to lie in recognizing that the analytical or discipline approach and the integrated or area approach have two different intellectual functions, both valid. The analytical disciplines must become universal in their treatment of human experience - a political science, economics, or philosophy which is only applicable to western culture is no longer adequate. But as the disciplines become more universal they also become more abstract and the danger increases that the student relying on them alone will miss the complications and imponderables which are part of every human situation. There needs to be also an approach in depth utilizing all the combined techniques of the various disciplines and taking the stubborn discrete facts of life into consideration. This is possible, however, only when our focus is limited in time and area. If the disciplines should become more universal our area approaches should be more limited to achieve maximum intellectual results - Europe is already far too big. I think then of the desirable relationship between area studies and the disciplines as analogous to that between clinical medicine, which deals with individual cases in all their human complications, and the preclinical sciences each of which provides a method and an organized body of knowledge derived from all the known experience of medicine.

The two approaches are complementary in another way. The study of a single culture is dependent on adequate analytical techniques but in turn an analysis which is more nearly universal in application can only be built up on the basis of competent limited studies on individual cultures. It is because of this latter dependence that we are only now finding increased opportunities for scholarship on the unusual areas to contribute significantly to some of the disciplines. It takes more than one generation of work on a new area to produce scholars who can combine depth of cultural understanding with the degree of competence in one of the established disciplines which will win a place for their work outside the area field. We are now beginning to get a few such scholars and it is important that they be encouraged. Let us look briefly at the situation in a few of the traditional humanistic and social science disciplines.

Two of the usual disciplines are now reasonably universal in their approaches: anthropology and linguistics. Anthropology, by its preoccupation

with relatively primitive societies was led early to explore the isolated corners and backwaters of mankind. The present scope of linguistics is also due to close association with anthropology: the modern "discovery" - from a Europo-centric point of view - of Sanskrit revolutionized the study of European languages but it was the analysis of African and American Indian languages undertaken by anthropologists or in close association with them which shook linguistics loose from the Indo-European tradition and forced a complete reworking of methods and theory to encompass phenomena of a diversity hitherto unimagined.

Sociology, in contrast, has thus far remained largely bound to American and European experience. It is for this reason that sociologists have played a minor role in the development of area studies while the anthropologists have struggled to apply their techniques to mature and complex societies such as the Japanese where presumably the sociologists should have more to offer. Perhaps efforts by both anthropologists and sociologists to deal with complex non-European cultures will bring the two disciplines closer together and contribute during the next several decades to important developments in the theory of human social organization.

Political science has done better than sociology but not as well as anthropology. In the nineteen twenties it was exceedingly rare to find a course in comparative government which dealt with any political system outside of Europe, North America and the British Commonwealth. Now the USSR is usually included and Japan and Argentina occasionally enter the picture. Political science as yet, however, deals with only a small fraction of human political behavior, and this is perhaps one of the reasons we tend to be naive about the problem of spreading democratic institutions around the world. Attempts to include non-western thought in courses in political philosophy must be rare - I am not aware of any. However, on a few areas now, notably Japan, we are beginning to get political studies of sufficient quality to contribute in a few years' time to more general concepts in political science.

In law only a beginning has been made. The University of Texas does some work on Latin American law, Yale and Harvard show some interest in comparative law although with little special attention to Asia (Harvard, like Northwestern, for many years has had a Japanese collection in its law library but with no faculty member competent to use it), and the University of Washington Law School has begun to emphasize oriental law in its journal. Stanford seems likely to receive a sizable Ford Foundation grant for study of Japanese law.

Philosophy has long flirted with the orient - Jesuit reports from China in the sixteenth century and the translation of some of the Hindu classics in the nineteenth both influenced western philosophers - but the marriage has never been consummated. Most of those who have sought to interpret oriental philosophy to the West have been either linguists or historians with inadequate knowledge of western philosophy, or philosophers without a knowledge of either oriental languages or oriental cultures sufficient for the interpretation of oriental thought with deep insight. The Foundation has helped the University of Hawaii to hold two summer conferences on "philosophy east and west" and to start a quarterly scholarly journal under that title. In addition travel grants have been given to a number of American philosophers to study in Asia

(Burt of Cornell, Morris of Chicago, Burch of Tufts) and to Asian philosophers to visit the United States or Europe (Suzuki of Japan, Nikaur and S. Abid Husain of India). But it is only recently that we have begun to find young scholars who combine adequate linguistic and area knowledge with sound training in western philosophy.

In the United States comparative religion is taught widely, but, as in the case of philosophy it is difficult to find persons with the necessary combination of training and experience. The inclusion of courses in theological school curricula is not always conducive to understanding treatment of non-Christian beliefs and practises. There is also very little attention to contemporary trends in the non-Christian religions. In this field the major Rockefeller Foundation contribution has certainly been the Islamic Institute at McGill University where Professor Wilfred Smith deals competently and sympathetically with the problems of contemporary Islam. In addition we have enabled Professor Paul Weiss of Yale to visit India for the study of contemporary Hinduism and Professor Kishimoto, Head of the Department of Religion at Tokyo, to spend a year at Stanford.

Art today approaches the catholicity of interest of linguistics or anthropology, and some attention to non-western art is probably now provided in almost all art curricula just as art is a part of almost every area studies program. America has the finest collections of Far Eastern art outside of Asia with a good core of competent curators to handle them. Foundation help seems less urgent here than in other fields.

Despite occasional influences of oriental music on the West, music seems at present to be one of the fields least open to ideas from outside the western tradition. A news bulletin on ethnomusicology is now being circulated from time to time and shows that the number of recordings of music from non-European cultures is substantial. But interest in these is largely anthropological. The officers have not yet been able to find a music school or department which takes comparative music seriously although it seems plausible that comparative study might contribute to the development of music in much the same way that the study of primitive and oriental art has contributed to the development of modern art in the West.

The broadening of the content of work in literature presents peculiar difficulties because of the close dependence of literature on language and the fact that the two have been almost universally linked in college instruction and departmental organization. There are few general departments of literature. The simple juxtaposition in a single department of separate courses on each of the world's literatures would serve little useful purpose. It is true that research and courses on "comparative literature" have long been recognized. In practise, however, this has meant the study of literary influences and few techniques have been developed for the comparison of unrelated or widely separated literatures. The study of the limited literary influences between orient and occident tends to sterility, but a more genuine comparison might tell us much of importance about differing value systems and the human goals and rewards of literary activity. The officers have sought to encourage comparative literature of this sort but have found only a few scattered opportunities: Professor

Tidestrom in Stockholm, Robert Hightower at Harvard, Professor Yamagiwa at Michigan, a summer conference at Indiana on oriental and western literary relations, Professor and Mrs. Kato of Nagoya University, and Professor Yoshikawa of Kyoto University.

Almost all history as now taught or written is area history. Presumably, however, there are two general courses which a history faculty of the future should offer: world history and philosophy of history or historical method. Some coherent concept of world history is almost essential to sanity these days. The Marxists are capitalizing on the need while historians in the free world as yet provide little competition. As in the case of literature mere juxtaposition of courses on different areas is not enough. Opportunities to support promising work on world history are few: the officers in the last several years have been able to recommend only three. We have sought opportunities in Asia but as yet without success. With attempts at world history so few we have tried to encourage writing of history in larger regional units - e.g. the history of the Americas project of the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

The difficulties and sporadic nature of the opportunities to help constructively toward the broadening out of the various disciplines account in part for the need to continue a substantial number of small-scale grants. Grants of this type also cause some confusion in classification because of their double value - they contribute both to better intercultural understanding and to the further development of one or another of the humanities or social science fields.

How Universal Must a University Be?

Does what has already been said here lead to the conclusion that every university must seek eventually to cover all social science and humanities disciplines and all areas? To do so certainly implies colossal institutions, greatly increased faculties, and enormous student bodies to provide the variety in student interest necessary to justify the variety in instruction. Library problems which are already critical (it is said that University libraries have been doubling in size nearly each decade) would become even more unmanageable since each new area presents large bibliographical problems: it is not unlikely that prior to about 1700 China printed more books than all the rest of the world put together; Japan regularly publishes more annually than does the U. S.; the USSR probably publishes more than any other country in the world; the Far Eastern library at Berkeley has a regular full-time staff of fifteen and still is unable to catch up on the cataloging of its backlog; the Library of Congress has something like half a million uncataloged Japanese items. Nor is it clear how or by whom such university expansion could be financed. And yet if a foundation officer asks at one of our great institutions why they wish to add work on area x when their previously started work on areas y and z is still inadequate, he is likely to get the answer "You cannot expect a great university like _____ not to have work on x."

I do not deny the possibility of some institution approaching universal area coverage - three of our major universities seem to be moving in this direction (whether by design or inadvertence is not clear). I do question the

practicability of this approach for the great majority of American educational institutions, I doubt that there is any intellectual necessity for it, and I suspect that the long-term result in the institutions which try it will be mediocrity in research and instruction. In our opinion the failures that have occurred in American study programs on the "unusual areas" have been due in considerable part to the fact that university administrations and faculties have recognized the necessity neither of choice nor of continuity. Without both choice and continuity it is doubtful that the resources for or the tradition of first-class work can be maintained. No student, of course, has the time to go deeply into many cultures even if a university provides the opportunity: he is likely to be confused if he tries.

What is the alternative? It seems to me that the minimum which makes good intellectual sense in this century in one institution is analytical work in the several disciplines which is universal in the subject matter it takes into consideration plus inter-disciplinary work in depth on two cultures: our own and one other. Perhaps much more is possible and desirable. But this minimum would provide a base in one's own culture, a knowledge of analytical techniques, some understanding of how analytical techniques must be combined and modified in dealing with living cultures, and the benefits of inter-cultural comparison. Provided that the foreign culture chosen for study varied from institution to institution this minimum within universities might, for the country as a whole, provide the kind of world-wide coverage we need.

The same limitation of objective would make economically possible quality work on even the unusual areas in the small colleges. Nothing of the sort is now in effect, however, with the possible exception of the growing concentration of work on Mexico and the American Southwest at Occidental College.

In fact it must be admitted that the logic of concentration of effort and division of labor seems at present to have little to do with what actually happens in our colleges and universities. There is more recognition in a few places of the need for limitation than there was fifteen years ago, but most new appointments of scholars with area training are being made without serious institutional consideration of longer term implications either for budgets or for curricula. Perhaps this is inevitable. Perhaps it is only through a long process of trial and error with each scholar fighting for his place in the university that we can evolve workable new patterns. If so, the process will certainly be wasteful in frustrated scholars and unused facilities (Cf. the Gest Chinese library at Princeton which was purchased for \$100,000 - half of it from the RF - and which has gone almost unused for some years since Princeton no longer maintains Chinese studies). The officers can only try to minimize the degree to which The Rockefeller Foundation shares in such wastage by withholding recommendations of assistance at institutions where faculty and administration planning in these fields appears inadequate.

Ancillary Questions

The experience of the last twenty years has brought to attention a variety of related problems some having to do with the wider application of the concept of "area studies," some with methodology, and some with the use and organization of language teaching.

There has been no single definition of the size of an "area" suitable for inter-disciplinary study. Michigan has a Center of Japanese Studies, the University of Washington a program on Northeastern Asia, and Columbia a Russian Institute. While "area studies" are usually thought of as concerned with national, linguistic, or even broader geographical regions, there have been some attempts, particularly by the anthropologists, to apply the term to much more limited zones, e.g. an intensive study of the Tarascan region in Mexico in which geographers, anthropologists, and sociologists participate is called an area study. The emphasis here is on the techniques of inter-disciplinary study of cultures.

Early emphasis was on the "unusual areas" outside the earlier concern of our educational system. During the war, however, it became obvious that, despite our long traditions of concern with European languages, literatures, and history the United States had few persons competent to deal with Europe or any of the European countries in the inter-disciplinary fashion the situation seemed to require. Had it not been for the emigrés it would have been about as difficult to recruit an economist thoroughly familiar with the German economy as it was to find one familiar with Japan. As a result there have developed proposals for European area studies - the Carnegie Corporation has given some help for such studies and the RF officers have done some exploration.

Anyone who has lived abroad or who has tried to teach about a foreign country to American students soon realizes that one of the major obstacles to understanding a foreign culture is ignorance of our own. Knowledge of two cultures is prerequisite for comparison. Moreover some of the lack of a firm base in American culture results not from lack of instruction but from the fact that the instruction too frequently remains abstract, general and historical so that even by the time of graduation from college a student may have only a vague understanding of the local society in which he lives. For these reasons the experience with foreign area studies has re-enforced interest in American studies and more particularly regional studies of the United States. The most recent example in the RF is our grant to the College of the City of New York for graduate study of the New York Metropolitan region.

I have suggested above that one of the advantages of area studies is that they provide a clinical rather than an abstract analytical approach to human culture (both are needed). When this inter-disciplinary aspect is stressed questions properly arise as to whether other inter-disciplinary studies are not equally justifiable. It is possible, for example to bring most of the social sciences and humanities together for studies on a topical basis, e.g. housing, or social security. This is quite justifiable but topical studies of this sort do not have some of the cultural and international values which were among our initial objectives in entering the foreign area field. There has also been much discussion as to the techniques and standards of inter-disciplinary work, both research and teaching. How much integration of different approaches can the student be expected to achieve if it is not achieved by the professors? On the other hand, can a single professor be sufficiently familiar with the approaches of a variety of different disciplines to present a single integrated course of lectures or a single book on a broad area? How much dependence must be put on symposia in print and on cooperative lecture series?

More interesting and significant is the development of research on the techniques of comparing the more intangible aspects of culture. How do value systems in Japan or India differ from those in the United States? What role does language play in channeling human thought? Such questions need better answers if studies of other cultures are to gain in depth of meaning. The Division of Humanities has sought approaches from linguistics and philosophy (e.g. Charles Morris at Chicago) while the Division of Social Sciences has encouraged the anthropologists (e.g. the Harvard University five-culture study of comparative value systems under Professor Clyde Kluckhohn and his associates).

The Army combined language and area training. Why are they not more effectively combined in the universities? Much of the answer lies in the fact that most language instruction is in European languages and most area programs are on Asia. Most area programs require foreign language use but most language instruction has been given without direct concern as to how the language is to be used. The Modern Language Association in its Rockefeller Foundation supported program for revitalizing language teaching in the United States is now attempting to encourage closer ties between language teaching and cultural studies.

There is one language aspect of the problem of world coverage which is not yet satisfactorily answered. How should instruction and research on the less important languages (e.g. Ilocano, Sundanese, Mahratti, Kurdish, or Hausa) be organized? Presumably the United States should not entirely neglect any one of these languages (or many more of still less importance) and yet, except in emergency, the demand for instruction in them will be very small. The American Council of Learned Societies, initially with RF help, has done a good deal to develop necessary teaching materials. It is currently operating under a grant of \$250,000 for this purpose from the Ford Foundation. Some people have advocated a national language school in Washington. At least one University department of linguistics has argued that it should be staffed to cover all the principal language families of the world. It has seemed to us, however, that the more practical approach in the decentralized American educational system would be for the principal centers of area studies to take responsibility for minimum language coverage of the areas with which they are concerned; i.e. Ilocano and Sundanese would be the responsibility of Cornell or Yale which have Southeast Asia programs; Mahratti would be the responsibility of a center of Indian studies, and Hausa the responsibility of a center of African studies. Under this pattern of division of labor the language instructors for the principal languages in each area could, perhaps, over a period of years develop stand-by facilities (e.g. recordings, reference books, and a minimum practical acquaintance) to meet occasional or emergency needs for work on the lesser languages. This of course, assumes a division of labor which has not yet emerged. None of the principal world areas, except possibly Europe, is now covered adequately by U. S. language training facilities. There is both an uneconomic amount of duplication on a few languages and no provision at all for many others.

Opportunities in Institutions Abroad

Whether the objective is cultural enrichment or more intelligent international relations, the need for studies of countries and cultures not now normally dealt with is not confined to the United States. While we perhaps have a special responsibility in the United States there is no reason under the RF charter why we should not aid such developments abroad as well as at home and we have in fact done so. Each country has, however, its own peculiar set of needs and its own complications in university organization and curricula. The officers have tried to keep in mind whatever has been learned from U. S. experience but at the same time to make allowances for national differences.

In Canada the RF has assisted Far Eastern studies at Toronto, Slavic studies at Toronto and Vancouver, and most recently the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill University. The Islamic program is one of the most interesting anywhere in the world. In its concern with contemporary aspects of one of the great religions it differs from the usual "area" program although it serves the same long-term objectives very effectively. The small number of Canadian Universities makes a division of labor in the area field both more urgent and more difficult than in the United States. Apparently few Canadians in government or in the universities have given much thought either to what Canada needs or how it might be achieved. The British tradition makes the tendency to stress language, literature and history to the exclusion of other subjects even more marked than in the United States. Canada's enhanced role in international affairs probably makes it urgent for her to develop more study of Asia but the need is primarily for modern studies not archaeology. The officers will probably wish to recommend additional help at McGill, but otherwise they hope to stimulate more discussion of Canada's needs before assisting further programs there.

In Great Britain since World War II most of the needs for Slavic and Asiatic studies have been met by the government under the plan developed by the Scarborough Commission. That program has now, however, been altered: earmarked grants have been discontinued, and the continuation of the activities initiated has been left to the discretion of the various universities under their general grants from the University Grants Committee. The English curriculum seems rather more inflexible and less conducive to inter-disciplinary work than the American. American studies can gradually be introduced bit by bit in history and literature and we have helped in this direction. The RF has also given aid to modern Near Eastern studies at Durham. Assistance to modern European studies at St. Antony's College in Oxford is now under discussion.

In Europe the Foundation has assisted Far Eastern studies in France, Scandinavia and Holland, and Latin American studies in France and Sweden. The most important aid has been to American studies through grants for the Salzburg Seminars and for the Amerika Institut in Munich as well as a series of fellowships and travel grants which we hope will result in larger developments. Asiatic studies have a brilliant past in Europe but a very uncertain future. Scholarship on Asia developed as an adjunct of empire and failed to achieve a more integral role in education, foreign affairs, business, or public opinion formation. Now that empires are shrinking rapidly and government support is

In Japan our major contribution has been in American studies and this primarily through the two seminar programs in Tokyo and Kyoto. It is probable that these two seminars if continued somewhat longer will result in the introduction of a moderate amount of study and teaching on the U. S. in many Japanese universities. We cannot yet see clearly what form this will take but presumably most of the work on the United States will be scattered among existing departments rather than concentrated in a single department or institute. In addition we have recently helped a program in Tokyo for contemporary Chinese studies and the director of the new Institute of Slavic studies at the University of Hokkaido was enabled to spend a fellowship year at Harvard. One fellowship has recently been awarded to a Japanese in Near Eastern studies and the officers hope eventually to have some relations with Japanese studies on Southeast Asia, India, and Latin America.

As has been indicated each country presents different problems. We have tried to apply abroad the same objectives as in the United States - cultural enrichment and the foundations for more intelligent international relations. In operating in more than one country along these lines it is possible to achieve additional gains by establishing contacts between scholars working on the same cultures or problems in different countries. We assume, for example, that in helping American studies abroad we have something to learn about ourselves from the work of foreign scholars as well as something to gain from having the United States better understood.

Conclusions

The broadening of the humanities and social sciences to take account of all the major cultures of the world is a complicated process. If there were time one would like to take it in smaller and more assimilable installments. But the momentum of world affairs leaves no time to spare. The RF would have to face problems of this sort even if it had not pioneered assistance to work on Asia and Russia twenty years ago. The complexity and apparent confusion is in part a result of success. When Japanese, Chinese, and Russian studies were rare, isolated, and largely philological it was simple to define the objectives and methods of assistance. To the degree which these studies have become a real part of our intellectual and educational life, however, their growth involves all the complexities of curriculum change, reorganization of the established disciplines, general education, and university organization. For most forms of aid it is no longer possible to define a single purpose. But multiple purposes do not mean confusion of purpose. There is no reason to assume that the Foundation's role in these matters should have been completed in twenty years, or that there is not plenty of room for the three major foundations now active. There is real need for The Rockefeller Foundation to continue in a field to which it has made an important contribution and in which it has an important asset in staff experience.

More specifically we anticipate the need for the Foundation to provide stabilizing capital grants for a few of the programs to which we have previously given support. We foresee less clearly a need for help to strengthen language work and to provide refresher opportunities for the best of the scholars who are in isolated positions. We believe necessary a continued substantial program of small-scale assistance particularly for more effective combinations of area and discipline work. We do not anticipate many recommendations for major support for new area programs in the United States but would wish to submit one for studies of India and Pakistan if a suitable location can be found. If the RF should become more active in assistance or operations in Africa we would suggest also interest in African studies in the United States but, barring such development of RF commitments in the field, we would leave African studies to the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation which have already shown a concern for them. We should like to continue exploration and modest help to area studies programs abroad much along present lines.

Charles B. Fahs

November 12, 1954