

# Pages from the Past: The Rockefeller Foundation, Global Area Studies and the SRC

David Wolff

The documents below represent pages from the pre-history of the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center (SRC) held in the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) Archives. In 1955, the SRC was attached to the Faculty of Law, a safe berth for the development of Slavic-Eurasian studies at Hokkaido University and in Japan. The SRC Winter Symposium in December 2015 celebrated that attachment, but Japan being Japan, we can be sure that many *uchiawase* and *nemawashi*, preparatory meetings and private contacts, took place first. The search for Japanese information on this formative phase has produced some wonderful memoir materials, gathered and discussed below by Dr. Tetsuro Chida, but no archives. Fortunately the RF archives, in particular the papers of Charles Burton Fahs, provide coverage of many such meetings that would otherwise have gone unreported. Adding Japanese memories to American documents helps to trace the evolution from embryonic ideas expressed in Fahs' memos of 1946 and 1949 to the Ministry of Education decision to establish the SRC at Hokkaido University in late summer 1952.

David Engerman's seminal study of Sovietology in the United States makes it clear that area studies development in the US during WWII, as successfully practiced by the Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services, led directly to RF involvement in the institutionalization of area studies, especially at Columbia University.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> David C. Engerman, *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (Oxford UP: New York, 2009).

The first head of the Russian Institute there, the Russian historian Geroid T. Robinson, had worked for the OSS, as had Charles Burton Fahs, a Japan specialist, who moved to the RF from 1946 as a grants officer in the humanities. Fahs himself is a perfect illustration of Engerman's argument, as his experience of wartime analysis for American intelligence, together with his interdisciplinary training, converted him to become a fervent believer in and supporter of area studies. His interest in Japan and contribution to reviving scholarship and the arts in Japan during the occupation bore many fruits, not least of which was the establishment of area studies centers on America, China and Russia.

Document One below from December 1946 is an internal memorandum penned by Fahs, reviewing achievements of and opportunities for area studies, as well as the proposed parameters of Rockefeller involvement with these developments. Familiar core principles for areas studies programs, such as language skill prerequisites and interdisciplinary coverage, are presented in brief. Praise for Columbia University's Russian Institute as "outstanding" may well have been meant as a retrospective tip of the hat to the memo's recipients, RF colleagues, all of whom had been involved in this initiative from 1944. Other points may be considered more specific and future-oriented. Point 9's plan to "move into development of centers overseas" was clearly a postwar novelty and Point 7's call for the RF to "withdraw" after establishing "minimum essential coverage for all areas of the world" would serve as the RF *modus operandi*. After assisting the creation of the SRC during the period 1948–1959, Fahs would "withdraw" completely, never once contacting the SRC from his post at the US Embassy in Tokyo, where he served as Minister-Counselor for Cultural and Public Affairs from 1962 to 1967.<sup>2</sup>

It should also be kept in mind that this 1946 memo was written before Fahs set foot in postwar Japan. After a 1947 reconnaissance visit to Japan and other countries in East Asia, Fahs produced more specific recommendations. In the section on "Interdivisional Programs," he added the following paragraph:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Personal communication from Professor Emeritus Togawa Tsuguo.

<sup>3</sup> David Wolff "The Rockefeller Foundation and the SRC, 1948-1952" (unpublished paper presented at SRC Winter Symposium, December 2016), 11.

Area Studies. Japan has never had the integrated social sciences and humanistic study of other countries which is aimed at in American “area” programs. It is badly needed to give depth of understanding and appreciation of other cultures as a basis for international relations. Most needed are American, Russian and Chinese studies. Russian studies probably cannot be developed systematically under occupation. There is already a good base for Chinese studies in Japan but new development may also encounter political difficulties....An American Studies Association has been organized in Tokyo and would welcome aid...While I think that area studies in Japan may eventually deserve our support I do not recommend any further immediate action.

Fahs critical attitude towards American occupation personnel and policies in Japan may have been at the root of his aversion to any immediate RF moves. In the same memo, he wrote scornfully that “the intellectual foundations of reorientation are too subtle for most military administrators.”<sup>4</sup>

Only in 1949, with the composition of Document Two provided below did Fahs move towards a more active stance, once there was reason to believe that progress was being made towards a peace treaty that would end the occupation. Fahs, a Washington insider even from his perch in New York, knew well the tensions between the Department of State and the military, but he would have also known that a compromise was in the making. In June 1949, he wrote to his colleagues basically declaring area studies development completed in the US, saying they might “have nearly reached the limit” in Far Eastern, Latin American and Slavic studies.

Nonetheless, he sketched “four major lines of development” to be considered further by potential funders. The fourth and final of these was to develop area studies outside the US. Japan was the first and foremost example.

The fourth major line of further advance is the development of similar patterns of area studies at institutions in other countries. [underlined in original] If the United States needs studies of the Far East, the Near East, Russia, etc., Japan also needs studies of the major areas of the world which impinge upon her economically or culturally. Humanities have

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 10.

recently secured appropriations to the University of Toronto and to the University of British Columbia for Slavic studies, to Tokyo University, the University of Stockholm, and the University of Leiden for Chinese studies, and to the University of Bordeaux for Latin American studies. Further developments in this direction are contemplated.

In a little over a year, Fahs had changed his mind and decided that Japan was ripe for area studies. Now he could and would move forward, although cautiously in the sensitive Slavic area.<sup>5</sup>

Document Three below is different from the previous ones, as it is a Japanese document, the only one we have about the Slavic Research Center that predates its establishment in 1953. It is a letter signed from Hokkaido University President Yoshichika Shima to Chester Barnard, the President of the Rockefeller Foundation, dated September 22, 1951. In this two-page letter, with a twenty-two page attachment, Shima detailed the need, environment, plan, personnel and budget for a new “Slavic Research Institute” to come into existence on April 1, 1953, the beginning of the Japanese school year and fiscal year. We know from the memoir materials provided in the next section by Dr. Chida that Professors Ogata and Kimura had stayed up all night putting this information together for President Shima to send to the Rockefeller Foundation. From the RF, Shima requested books and training for 2–3 professors to staff the new SRC. Because Hokkaido University was “the only national university in Japan having Russian specialists among its staff,” President Shima concluded that “ours is the only one university entitled to have such an institution in Japan.”

The fact that Shima asked for exactly the support that the RF was prepared to offer, also suggests prior communications on this key subject. In this connection, one might wonder at the background to Fahs 11 January 1951 telegram to Colonel Donald Nugent, the head of the Civil Information and Education Section, the man in charge of educational matters under SCAP.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> This caution was appropriate. Red Purge in Japan and McCarthyism in the US were on the horizon. The ultimate decision to place the SRC in the Law Faculty rather than the Faculty of Letters may well have been politically-motivated as well.

<sup>6</sup> Wolff, 16, 19.

The question was raised with me recently as to the possibility of fellowships for one or more of the Japanese scholars interested in Russian studies. This is a question that I have not raised earlier because of its obvious complications. On the one hand it can be said that encouragement of Russian studies in Japan may be undesirable. On the other hand, one can argue that such studies are necessary and inevitable and that it is important to have scholars in touch with American centers of Slavic studies where they can get a balanced point of view. I will do nothing on this until I talk with you. The three men who have been mentioned to me as possibilities are: Toriyama and Kimura of Hokkaido University and Iwama of Tokyo University. Philip Mosely of the Russian Institute at Columbia University tells me that he thinks a properly qualified Japanese scholar with ability in English would be welcome there.

On February 23, the day after arriving in Tokyo, Fahs met with Nugent who “indicated that there would no objection with regard to negotiations for Russian studies” or with the three professors. Nugent, whose office had recently handled the “Red Purge,” would certainly have checked these names against his lists. Sometime during this trip, Fahs also met with Iwama, as described in the Material 4 of Dr. Chida’s article below. Clearly, the ground was being cleared for Russianists months prior to President Shima asking for them to be supported.

Shima’s application narrative also does not mention prior contact between Hokkaido University and Fahs, although the RF representative had visited Sapporo and the Hokkaido University campus in June 1948 and met Shima’s predecessor. Although Professor Ogata is mentioned and his visit to America in 1950–1951 as well, nothing is said about Ogata’s most recent visit to the Rockefeller Foundation Headquarters in New York City and his talk with Fahs. In short, the preliminary discussions leading to the creation of the SRC need to be documented mainly with memoir material due to the paucity of archival materials, especially on the Japanese side. The only Japanese document to yet emerge from pre-SRC years, written in English on Hokkaido University letterhead stationery, is published below for the first time.

A close reading of the documents below, together with Dr. Chida’s following contribution, provides a fuller picture of the SRC’s prehistory than has previously been available. I hope it can serve as a next step towards illuminating issues still obscure.

## DOCUMENTS

### DOCUMENT ONE

(Memo by Fahs, 3 December 1946, Folder 165, Box 31, Series 900, RG 3.2, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center)<sup>7</sup>

[Underlining, both red and black, as in original document]

CBF [Charles Burton Fahs]

December 3, 1946

DHS [David Harrison Stevens]

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 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> All three of the documents below are printed with permission granted by the Rockefeller Archive Center.

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.

[...]

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.

## DOCUMENT TWO

(Memo by Fahs, 10 June 1949, Folder 165, Box 31, Series 900, RG 3.2, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center)

CBF

June 10, 1949

JM [John Marshall]

EFD [Edward F. D'Arms]

CG [Chadbourne Gilpatric]

### AREA STUDIES

The basic concept of area studies is the application of many or all of the social science and humanistic disciplines, sometimes also natural science disciplines, toward a better understanding of a single region, well defined in both geography and time, preferably through attention to specific problems. An area program is thus a focus for the practical application of methods and concepts in the established disciplines, not a substitute or alternative to those disciplines. In this application of several disciplines to specific human problems, area studies are similar to the utilization of all branches of medical knowledge in the study of the specific ailments of patients in a medical clinic. Area studies provide a method of bringing both students and scholars down to earth from elaboration of theoretical and abstract principles to the study of real life in its practical complexities. They are one of the best means of demonstrating the inter-relationships between the various methods of studying man. It is because of practicality and escape from the limitations of single disciplines that area studies are particularly useful for better international understanding; either for war or for peace.

From this point of view, studies of regions both in the United States and in foreign countries can be considered "area studies." In fact, both are necessary and should be considered together. Comparison is essential. Our own problems cannot be understood without the perspective which study of a different culture provides. On the other hand, study of a foreign culture will be without insight if it is not based on practical knowledge of one's own. The student needs broad understanding of the American base and of at least one foreign area, in addition to the usual disciplines. This is a heavy requirement, however, which can hardly be met without a major reexamination and reformation of curriculum, both courses and content. How to fuse these elements into some new viable educational pattern is the major problem of assimilation of the new area approach by the universities.



[...]

If one considers only the study of foreign areas at institutions in the United States, the RF program has had even more marked success. Work on the Far East, Latin America, and the USSR is now well established at a number of institutions, each. These programs, many of which owe their initiation to RF assistance, paved the way for the army area studies programs during the war and the increasingly wide acceptance of the area study concept.

[...]

The general fields of Far Eastern, Latin American, and Slavic studies are now not only past the pioneering stage, but may have nearly reached the limit.

[...]

There remain, however, four major lines of development in foreign area studies which should still be considered.

The first is the extension of the area studies principle to the remaining important, neglected areas of the world. Some of these neglected areas fall within the general scope of the programs already developed. There is, for example, inadequate work on Korea, despite the general programs of study on the Far East. For other major areas, notably the Near East, India, Southeast Asia, and Central Asia, the programs now in operation in the United States are quite inadequate to meet national needs. Finally, there are areas of considerable importance such as Africa and Australasia on which there is no single center of coordinated study at any institution in the country.

Second, as has been suggested above, a major obstacle to the production of a larger number of scholars for an area field is the lack of teaching openings through which they can be supported. This in turn is due to the fact that no effective place for area work in undergraduate general education programs has yet been found. The program at Occidental College already mentioned is a promising experiment in this direction, as is also the general education course on Far Eastern civilization which is to be developed at Columbia University under a Carnegie grant. The University of Hawaii would seem to be an unusually promising place for experimentation in this direction, if the proper leadership should develop there. The possibility should not be ruled out of further RF assistance to one or more promising experiments in this direction.

A third major opportunity is for introduction of materials on the unusual areas into the established disciplines. The last ten years has seen some, but distressingly little, progress in this direction. On the whole, comparative government continues to pay attention to Europe alone,

comparative literature continues to ignore both the Near and the Far East, our philosophers are too little acquainted with other schools of thought than those of the West. This is the pattern into which several of the smaller Humanities projects fit; for example, the aid to Dr. Hightower at Harvard for a handbook of Chinese literature, the bibliography of translations from the Chinese being prepared under the auspices of the ACLS, the work of Ragini Devi on Indian dances. The major projects on Russian translations, Near Eastern translations, and the East-West Philosophers Conference at Honolulu belong in this pattern as well. Much further work is needed in this field, which is the logical next step beyond our more general support to Slavic, Latin American, and Far Eastern studies. Here area studies merge with other phases of the Humanities program.

The fourth major line of further advance is the development of similar patterns of area studies at institutions in other countries. If the United States needs studies of the Far East, the Near East, Russia, etc., Japan also needs studies of the major areas of the world which impinge upon her economically or culturally. Humanities have recently secured appropriations to the University of Toronto and to the University of British Columbia for Slavic studies, to Tokyo University, the University of Stockholm, and the University of Leiden for Chinese studies, and to the University of Bordeaux for Latin American studies. Further developments in this direction are contemplated.

There are four new lines in which the RF can pioneer with profit. If they are pursued, they will keep budget needs in the field of area studies near the present level for some years, even if every effort is made to have as much of the burden as possible carried by other sources of funds such as the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the U.S. Government in the United States, or the University Grants Commission in Great Britain.

DOCUMENT THREE

(Shima to Barnard, 22 September 1951, Folder 3627, Box 543, Series 609, RG 2 1951, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Archive Center)

THE HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY<sup>8</sup>  
SAPPORO JAPAN

September 22, 1951

Prof. Yoshichika Shima  
President of the Hokkaido  
University  
Sapporo, Japan

Dr. Chester I. Barnard  
President of the Rockefeller Foundation  
49 West 49th Street,  
New York, New York, U.S.A

Dear Sir:

The cultural exchange between Japan and the United States of America is recovering rapidly after the War, and we are, directly or indirectly, enjoying its fruitful results. Without the benefits brought about by these happy circumstances, it would be scarcely possible to achieve successfully our academic mission. This all, I believe, owes to the generous support given us by the United States of America and particularly by your Foundation. I express my deep sense of gratitude to you, taking it into consideration that the present political and economic difficulties in Japan are preventing us from performing our intended scientific activities.

My colleague Professor Ogata participated in the American Seminar as a member of its Executive Committee, and enjoyed the privilege of travelling in the United States of America in order to research the present situation of the American area study. Since he came back to Japan, he has been endeavouring to disseminate needed informations on the results and methods of the area study in America. And it is my firm conviction that the method of the area study, once introduced to our universities, will not

---

<sup>8</sup> These top two lines are President Shima's letterhead and appear on each page of the letter to President Barnard in the upper left corner.

David Wolff

fail to give many happy suggestions to Japanese scholars working in the fields of social and cultural sciences.

When our University newly established departments of social and cultural sciences in 1947, we invited a few specialists in Russian history, economics and literature as members of the staff, with the intention of giving a new orientation to the Russian study of Japan. Up to now, ours is the only national university in Japan having Russian specialists among its staff.

Since April of this year, we have been working out a plan for the establishment of a Slavic Institute. As you see in the accompanying paper, our intention consists in promoting the Russian study on the lines of the American area study. And, if we can realize this intention of ours, then we are sure to make an original and important contribution to the Slavic study. But, as you know, the present economic situation of our country is too poor to permit of such an experiment. After the War, our Government would not agree to the establishment of new institutions at its expense. Nevertheless, we will not give up our plan, because we believe that our experiment will not fail to yield a rich harvest.

I trust you will appreciate our real motive, and I hope you will back up the realization of our plan by any possible means. I shall deeply appreciate, if you can help us towards preparing the necessary materials of our Slavic study, and dispatching two or three from among the expected members of our institute to your country in order to introduce the achievements and methods of the Slavic area study.

Sincerely yours,  
(Signature)

Yoshichika Shima  
President of the Hokkaido University

## A. Reasons for the establishment

### I. Why we should have Slavic area study in Japan.

(1) The necessity of area studies which have been eagerly encouraged in U.S.A., is urgent in Japan also for the following two reasons.

(a) We can not stress too much the importance of mutual understanding among the nations. This holds true particularly for Japan in view of her present situation in the world. Area study will offer the only one way of fostering this mutual understanding.

(b) The area studies necessarily make possible inter-disciplinary co-operation which have been difficult to promote successfully in Japan. We expect also, that they will give even a [sic] essential change to Japanese science in general which evidently had a mere speculative character, and that they will play a very important role in destroying the deep rooted sectionalism in the various phases of Japanese scientific activities.

(2) We believe that the Slavic study should be organized in Japan after the method of the area study in U.S.A. At present, the area studies on U.S.A., as well as England, Germany and France, are being planned in Tokyo University, and also in some others. But the area study with Slavic area as its object is completely neglected as yet. However, according to our opinion, the Slavic area study must be organized in Japan also. One reason for this is that the present situation of Japan in the world necessarily requires a more profound and through-going investigation than that we have had hitherto, which, as will be started below, was made from extremely narrow and biased points of view. Another reason is the fact that the national character of the Slavs, their mental disposition, their ways of thinking, are considered to have many sides which we Orientals can understand much easier than Occidentals. Therefore, if the Slavic area study is organized in our country, we are sure to make some important contributions to the Slavic study in Europe and America.

II. The above considerations lead us to the conclusion that the Slavic study, viewed from the angle of area studies, has abundant reason to be promoted in Japan.

Now, we shall describe in a few words the present and past of the Slavic study in Japan. The history of the Slavic, or rather Russian study in Japan traces back to 1904–1905 i.e. to the time of Russia-Japanese War. This history has two characteristic features which can be easily pointed out. On the one hand, the Russian study served exclusively for military or imperialistic aims of the Government and it was promoted,

for example, by the specialists of the Investigation Section of the South Manchurian Railway Company, of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and especially, of the Russian Section of the East Asia Institute, which was organized and conducted under the auspices of the Department of War and General Staff. On the other hand, things Russian (and Soviet) were studied among the leftist groups for the purpose of a political propaganda. Thus, the object of the Russian study in Japan was from the outset a peculiarly deviated one, i.e. either preparation of materials for the exploitation of Manchuria and for the measurement of the military power of the Soviet Union, which was the hypothetical enemy of the Japanese army, or it was arbitrary propaganda of the Soviet ideology. It must be added, however, that in the field of literature there were a few specialist who adopted a more impartial attitude. But they were mainly translators of Russian and Soviet literature, and studied things Russian more often than not from a dilettantish viewpoint, so that we can say that the results of their study cannot be of great use to our Slavic study.

III. For the reasons suggested above we believe that the Slavic research after the method of the area study should be instantly inaugurated and promoted in our country. Needless to say that for this purpose the establishment of a Slavic research institute is indispensable. And, in determining the main character of such an institute, following points should be taken into consideration.

(a) The institute should aim at the promotion of a true mutual understanding among the nations.

(b) Therefore, the institute, besides a wide research in the Slavic area, should devote special attention to the training of citizens and officials equipped with a sound knowledge of the area.

(c) The object of the research should not be restricted to the Soviet Union alone, but cover the whole Slavic area. Also it should not be confined to the field of literature as such, or to military or economical factors. We should investigate the Slavic area in its entity with the co-operation of all disciplines concerned. And this, we think, is no less than the method of the area study.

(d) In carrying out our works, we should endeavor to exclude any influence of militaristic or imperialistic policies, as well as political propagandas. Our approach must be a scientific one. If we consistently have this in our mind, then our prime object, i.e. the promotion of mutual understanding among the nations, would be a natural result.

IV. So far, we cannot find out in Japan any university or college which has planned the Slavic study from the viewpoint of the area study.

There are some colleges, it is true, in which intensive courses in Russian are offered, but these colleges only aim at fostering specialists in Russian language. Moreover, Russian research institutions which served for militaristic purpose before the World War II were dissolved for natural reasons. So we have at present no nucleus of the Russian to say nothing of the Slavic study in Japan.

Now, in our university, we have established in 1942 chairs of Russian language and literature in the Department of Cultural and Social Sciences. This means that the Slavic study was one of the main interests of our university. Also, it was nothing but a natural course of our intention that we invited a professor of history having his specialty in the field of Russian history, and professors interested in the study of Russian economics. The establishment of chairs of Russian literature and language and invitation of Russian specialists as professors was a trail unheard of in the history of Japanese national universities, and even now this remains the only exceptional system in our country. We can say in this connection that we were conscious of the necessity of the Slavic area study, and tried to carry it out, although we knew nothing of the conception and method of the area study developed in U.S.A. Now that the cultural exchange with U.S.A began to be active after the War and we came to know the realities of the area study in America, we earnestly hope to introduce the American method of area study to Japan. Our task, then, is the realization of it. We believe that ours is the only one university entitled to have such an institution in Japan.

3. [sic] Plans for the establishment.

1. Name: Slavic Research Institute of the Hokkaido University.

2. Time of the establishment: April, 1953

3. The Slavic Research Institute will be attached to the University of Hokkaido. Accordingly, we can expect the current expenditure of the institute will be covered by the governmental disbursement.

4. For the time being, the staff of ten persons will be needed to carry out our research and training program. We expect to fill up this staff gradually in three years ending 1955. We have already four professors in our campus who are qualified to participate in this project.

## (1) Staffing plan

	1953	1954	1955	Total
Language & Literature	2*	1**		3
History	1*		1**	2
Economics	1*	1**		2
Government	1**			1
Social Relations			1**	1
International Relations			1**	1
Total	5	2	3	10

Remarks — \* Present members of Hokkaido Univ.

\*\* Members of other institutions, who are expected to join us.

## (2) Names and specialities of those who are expected to participate

Name	Specialities	Present Position
Shoichi KIMURA	Literature & Language	Assistant Prof. of Hokkaido Univ.
Nobuyuki KITAGAKI	Language & Literature	Assistant Prof. of Hokkaido Univ.
Yukihito KANEKO	Language & Literature	Lecturer of Hitot[s]ubashi Univ.
Shigeto TORIYAMA	History	Assistant Prof. of Hokkaido Univ.
Toru IWAMA	History	Prof. of Tokyo Women's Col.
Kuraichiro UTSUMI	Economics	Assistant Prof. of Hokkaido Univ.

(3) Following persons are expected to co-operate with us at least as visiting professors.

Bokuro EGUCHI	International Relations	Prof. of Tokyo Univ.
Masamichi INOKI	Government	Prof. of Kyoto Univ.

[...]



(b) Program of studies.

i. General Courses

Literature

Contemporary Russian Literature First Session.	Mr. KIMURA	2 units
Russian Literature of the 19th Century First Session	Mr. KITAGAKI	2 units
History of Russian Criticism Second Session	Mr. KIMURA	2 units

History

Contemporary Russian History First Session	Mr. TORIYAMA	2 units
History of Russia since 1801 First Session	Mr. TORIYAMA	2 units
History of Russia to 1800 Second Session	Mr. TORIYAMA	2 units

Economics

The Economy in Soviet Russia and Adjacent Countries First Session	Mr. UTSUMI	2 units
History of Russian Economy First Session	Mr. UTSUMI	2 units
Socialist Economics Second Session	Mr. UTSUMI	2 units

Government

Introduction to the Political Institutions of U.S.S.R. Second Session	Mr. INOKI	2 units
--	-----------	---------

David Wolff

Russian and Soviet Political Thought since 1900  
Second Session Mr. INOKI 2 units

Political History of East European Countries  
First Session Mr. INOKI 2 units

Social Relations

Social Institutions of the Soviet Union and the East European Countries  
Second Session Not given in 1953 2 units

History of Russian Social Thought  
Second Session Not given in 1953 2 units

Social Problems in the Soviet Union  
First Session Not given in 1953 2 units

International Relations

Russia and Eastern Europe in World Politics  
Second Session Mr. EGUCHI 2 units

Activities of the Comintern & the Cominform  
Second Session Mr. INOKI 2 units

The Soviet Union in World Economics  
First Session Mr. UTSUMI 2 units

ii. Research Courses

Literature

Soviet Literary Theory  
Second Session Mr. KIMURA 2 units

History

Studies in the Russian Revolution of 1917  
Second Session Mr. TORIYAMA 2 units

Pages from the Past

Economics

The Five-year Plans Second Session	Mr. UTSUMI	2 units
---------------------------------------	------------	---------

Government

Soviet Constitutional History First Session	Mr. INOKI	2 units
--	-----------	---------

Social Relations

Selected Problems in the Soviet Institution First Session	Not given in 1953	2 units
--	-------------------	---------

International Relations

Selected Problems in the Soviet Foreign Policy First Session	Mr. EGUCHI&INOKI	2 units
---	------------------	---------

iii. Courses in Russian\*

Advanced Russian Full Year	Mr. KITAGAKI	2 units
-------------------------------	--------------	---------

Advanced Russian Reading Full Year	Mr. KIMURA	2 units
---------------------------------------	------------	---------

---

These Courses are offered by the Department of Russian.  
[...]

D. Research Programs

We intend to have our own research programs which should be carried out by our own research staff in co-operation with the specialists in this country.

The expected programs to be researched are as follows.

(1) Nationalism in Slavic Area.

Nationalism plays a remarkable role among backward peoples as a main driving force of their activities

(2) Russia and the Far East.

The dynamics of the Russian policy should necessarily be investigated in connection with the Far East.

(3) The Ways of Thinking of the Slavs.

We intend to pursue this from the linguistic point of view, examining the results thus gained in the light of historical, economic and political facts.

(4) Soviet Society expressed in the Literature.

We believe that the study of literature as an index of the Soviet daily facts can serve as a substitute for field studies which are now impossible.

E. Estimated Expenditure

(1) The annual current expenditure is expected to be covered by the governmental disbursement. It includes salaries and general cost for facilities.

Salaries:

For 5 Professors:	¥900,000
For 10 assistants to the research staff	¥900,000
For 3 secretaries	¥300,000

---

Total ¥2,100,000

Expenditure for facilities:

For books and publications	¥1,000,000
For other facilities	¥800,000

---

Total ¥1,800,000

Sum total of the annual current expenditure      ¥3,900,000

(2) Expenditure for the Establishment.

As for the expenditure which will be necessary during the establishing three years, we can not expect the governmental disbursement under present conditions. Thus, the only way left to us is to look for donations.

---

The expenditure for other 5 professors will be covered by the disbursement of each department outside the institute.

Pages from the Past

(1) Books, publications and materials:		
Literature*	200 vols.	\$ 800
Language*	150 vols.	\$ 600
History*	700 vols.	\$ 2,800
Government	800 vols.	\$ 3,200
Economics*	700 vols.	\$ 2,800
Social Relations	300 vols.	\$ 1,200
International Relations	200 vols.	\$ 800
Others	200 vols.	\$ 800
Total		\$13,000
(2) Typewriter 5 \$650		
(3) Microfilm 1 set \$150		

The sum total of the expenditure for the establishment  
\$13,800<sup>9</sup>  
\$21,000

---

\* We have already about 1,200 volumes of books of literature, language, history and economics.

#### F. Working plans.

(1) For the purpose of a better organization of our Slavic Research Institute we believe that we should refer to the Slavic or Russian area study in the United States. We lost our contact with American scientific activities since about 1934. After the war, when we reestablished this contact, we found out that Russian studies in America had taken long strides since then. But if this progress meant only a quantitative one, we would not be so much surprised. We must not lose sight of the fact that this great achievement had been the very result of an essential methodological change, that is to say, the method of research was that of area study, and only through this methodological change the American area study could enjoy good results.

Accordingly, when we plan the establishment of our Slavic research institution, the first step we should take is to learn the present situation of Russian study in U.S.A. And, frankly speaking, this absorption of methods and achievements in America would be able only through the

---

<sup>9</sup> The sum \$13,800 is penned in, accurately adding up the budget items above. How the number \$21,000 came to be typed in as the total is unclear.

direct contact with American scholars. We must endeavour to find out any possible way to send at least two or three scholars among us who are expected to participate in our plan. They should study there at least one full year from the spring semester of 1952. Their coming back just means our real first step to the organization of our research institution.

(2) Until 1955 we must ensure the money for the establishment of our institution. But, for this portion of expenditure we can not depend upon governmental disbursement, so we must look for the endowment. With this indispensable contribution, we must endeavor, on the one hand, to collect the rare and valuable materials in Japan which are now scattering away because of natural dissolution of such institutions as above mentioned, and on the other hand, we must also endeavor to get American publications of Russian studies since 1935. Of course, we should not forget to obtain Russian original materials, if we can.

The desirable amount of donations are [sic] as follows:

Until April, 1953	at least	\$10,000
Until April, 1954	at least	\$6,000
Until March, 1955	at least	\$5,000

(3) When we can be sure of the possibility of being given \$10,000 until the spring of 1953, we can establish our Slavic Research Institute from April, 1953, consulting with the Ministry of Education.

(4) During the three years after the establishment, our effort should be the training of the candidates for research staff.