

The Impact of Private Fellowship Programs on Japan's Foreign
Cultural Relations during and after the Cold War Period

MAKITA, Toichi

1. Fellowship program: A mechanism of inclusion and exclusion

Before we attempt to evaluate the nature and influence of fellowship programs of private philanthropy in Japan, it would be useful to examine what “fellowship” means etymologically. According to scholar Hirano Ken’ichiro, current usage of “fellowship” to denote a program to provide financial assistance to scholars derives from the original meaning of the word “fellow.” He cites the *Oxford English Dictionary*¹:

“In colleges chiefly devoted to the purposes of study and education, the Fellows were, in early usage, often included under the term scholars; the latter term is, in later usage, mostly is restricted to junior members of the foundation, who are still under tuition, the term fellow being applied to the Senior Scholars, who have graduated, or otherwise passed out of the stage of tutelage.”

This explanation makes clear the difference in British universities between scholarship programs that provide undergraduate students with financial assistance and fellowship programs for postgraduates and others who are considered to be senior. The former are essentially educational, produce results in the long run, and aim to nurture a wide range of young talents who might become not only academics, but also businessmen, bureaucrats, medical doctors, school teachers, or in fact any kind of professionals. On the other hand the latter are more academic or cultural, with limited and specified targets, and are intended to yield definite results in the comparatively short term.

In this British original meaning of fellowship, Hirano stresses that the basic sense is “to be a fellow” in an academic community. This meaning could be extended to connote “to admit somebody as a fellow.” The notion of fellowship was not yet related to money, but to qualification of a person to be admitted as a member of a certain academic community. Then, a fellowship program meant sending somebody to an academic institution to be admitted as a fellow of that institution.

From the viewpoint of academia in our own time, fellowship programs are designed to act upon the will to increase “fellows” or “academic colleagues” by providing certain privileges to non-members of an academic institution—privileges such as free admission to its facilities. In order to maintain a high standard for “fellows” and preserve the integrity of the academic institution offering the fellowships, it is universally accepted that criteria for eligibility and selection should be clearly defined and procedures for admitting fellows well established. Not all can meet the standard to be admitted as a

fellow. It is natural, therefore, that there should be an “exclusive” aspect as well as an “inclusive” aspect of fellowship.

On the part of philanthropic foundations that provide funding to senior scholars to become a fellows of a foreign academic institution, the purpose of their grants is not only providing opportunities to promising scholars to develop their own capabilities and creativity, but also to facilitate creation of personal networks with accepting institutions and foreign academics. Those networks then enrich academia of the program’s target country as a whole. At this level of fellowship programs also, we can find “inclusive” and “exclusive” aspects. The foundations typically select countries their fellowship programs cover and designate particular academic institutions as acceptable hosts of their fellows. By doing this, foundations can exert influence on how and where academic networks develop. The fellows often do not care much or understand fully what the foundation’s intention might be, but the foundations are deeply concerned about their programs’ impact as a whole on the academic or intellectual development of the countries from which fellows are chosen and the countries to which they are sent.

2. Planning postwar Japanese cultural relations with the world in the Cold War: John F. Dulles and John D. Rockefeller III in early 1950 and afterwards

Unique among non-Western nations as the first to attain modernization and become a world power, Japan in its modern history faced a serious national identity problem, i.e., “East vs. West.” Before World War II, virtually all Japanese who thought about this question conceived it in terms of a dichotomy of the Oriental or Asia and the Occidental or Europe. But after World War II, a new “East vs. West” issue Cold War subsumed the old “Oriental vs. Occidental” issue. This was the Cold War. For Japan, which had redefined itself as a loyal ally of the United States, the most difficult problem of international relations during the Cold War period lay not in its relationship with Soviet Russia, but in that with China. In the modern diplomatic history of Japan, relationships with America and China have always been complex, and love-hate relationships have often prevailed. In this context of Japan-U.S. and Japan-China relations during the Cold War, American philanthropic foundations strategically applied fellowship programs’ “inclusive” and “exclusive” nature to Japan’s cultural relations in order to draw a line between the West and the East. Later, in the post Cold War period, Japanese foundations sought to nudge foreign relations in a different direction by utilizing same mechanism, i.e., fellowship programs. Over the last six decades, the fellowship programs of American and Japanese private foundations show quite clearly where or in which

world the grant-givers wanted Japanese academia and intellectuals make “fellows” or personal networks.

In the following pages, firstly I will try to depict how the American private foundations designed their fellowship programs, in collaboration with their Japanese partners, to encourage Japanese intellectuals and academics to develop intimate “fellow” relations with their Western counterparts and by doing this to bring Japan’s cultural or academic relations in line with the American side in the divided Cold War world. Then I will show how later, in the 1970s, the Japanese government applied the same method to reinforce Japan-U.S. relations that successive incidents of trade friction had jeopardized. At the end of this paper I will briefly describe how, when the Cold War finally ended in the 1990s, Japanese philanthropies tried to rebalance their nation’s cultural relations by initiating fellowship programs with Asia.

(1) Rockefeller Report

During the occupation period (1945–1952), the U.S. government started educational exchange programs by sending a small number of Japanese students to American universities and American teachers to Japan. The U.S. government implemented the first scholarship program using funds that had been budgeted for emergency relief under the Government and Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) program, which operated in Germany, Japan, and Austria. With GARIOA program support, from 1949 to 1951 about 1,000 Japanese students went to American universities to study. A smaller private program of scholarships for Japanese students to study at American institutions is the Grew-Bancroft Foundation, started in 1950. The name of the foundation commemorated the service of two American ambassadors in prewar Japan. The program has awarded scholarships to more than 120 Japanese until now. In 1952, after the restoration of Japan’s independence, the Fulbright Program was expanded to include Japan. The total number of Japanese Fulbrighters now surpasses 6,000, and American Fulbrighters who came to study in Japan number 2,300.² These scholarship programs have been instrumental in strengthening Japan-U.S. cultural relations over the long run, but at first, in the early 1950s, many American policymakers believed it was inappropriate for the government to design and implement such programs, and the State Department therefore invited a prestigious private foundation to do the job.

The Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, who as ambassador-at-large had negotiated the San Francisco Treaty or Treaty of Peace with Japan in 1951, understood the importance of Japanese industrial potential and was resolute that it should not go fall under Soviet control. In the Cold War strategy of the

Eisenhower administration, Japan's importance was regarded as next only to Europe, and U.S. policy was shaped so as to retain Japan in the domain of the U.S. close allies. To keep Japan on the U.S. side, the administration considered that values common in the West must take root in Japan and a relationship of mutual trust should be constructed between Japan and America. Dulles correctly foresaw that the vast Chinese market would attract postwar Japan business, as it had in the prewar period.

Dulles did not agree with those who argued that the U.S. government should engage heavily in propaganda activity in Japan or establish conditions for approval of Japanese independence. He judged that such measures would repel Japanese public opinion. Rather he thought that the goals of U.S. strategy would be more readily achieved if the U.S. government mitigated discriminatory treatment of Japanese migrants in the U.S. and strengthened mutual exchange between Japanese and American intellectuals. As President of the Rockefeller Foundation before his appointment as Secretary of State, Dulles thought that private initiatives would be better than government programs. He invited John D. Rockefeller III to accompany him on a trip to Japan, and he asked Rockefeller to design programs that would create favorable U.S.-Japan cultural relations.³

Rockefeller accepted Dulles's invitation and met with more academics than politicians during his stay in Japan. He relied on his old Japanese acquaintances, "fellows" whom he had met at the conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations held in Kyoto in 1929. These men formed a kind of pro-Anglo-American "liberal" element in Japanese academic and business circles. They had lost influence during the period of militarism and war, but many—including Takagi Yasaka, Matsumoto Shigeharu, and Matsukata Saburo—were still vigorous when Rockefeller reconnected with them. Rockefeller also met with some more left-leaning intellectuals and people with a social democratic orientation such as Royama Masamichi, Nanbara Shigeru, and Hani Goro.⁴ Although American philanthropy's foreign contacts have often been deliberately limited, historically, on grounds of disagreement over ideology,⁵ in those days Japanese liberals and social democrats were considered as acceptable targets and potential partners of American philanthropy. Only stubborn nationalists on the right or hardcore socialists or communists on the left were excluded.

Rockefeller compiled his report on the cultural relations between the U.S. and Japan, with the help of Japanese studies experts such as Edwin Reischauer and George Sansom. In the report he proposed three concrete measures: promotion of exchange among intellectual leaders, establishing U.S.-Japan and Japan-U.S. cultural centers in both countries, and founding of a residential facility in Tokyo where international

exchange would be promoted. He stressed the importance of mutuality of the program, not only pushing Japanese to understand America, but also Americans to understand Japan. The report emphasized that private actors should implement these programs by cultural means, not government agencies by political means. The Department of State decided to implement personal exchange programs of its own as a part of its public information (or propaganda) activity, but it would follow Rockefeller's suggestion and let the private sector implement the other two elements, i.e., cultural centers and an international house. Dulles asked Rockefeller himself to realize these plans.⁶

(2) International House of Japan: Locus of exchange programs in 1950s–1960s

Rockefeller returned to Japan in 1951 and discussed with Japanese counterparts the proposal to establish a cultural center and an international house. A plan emerged that combined the two functions, and it was realized as the International House of Japan in 1955. The Japanese side formed a preparatory committee with members from academia and business. Kabayama Aisuke, a businessperson, became the chair, and Matsumoto and Takagi were among the key members. About half of the members were Americans residing in Japan for business or teaching. Matsumoto was a widely recognized international journalist who had tried to stop the war with China through his personal connection with Chinese politicians and Konoe Fumimaro, the three-time (1937–39, 1940–41, 1941) prime minister of Japan. Matsumoto was on good terms with Yoshida Shigeru, the first prime minister of independent Japan and the signer of the San Francisco Treaty, who was a kind of boss of “liberal minded” politicians. Through Yoshida, Matsumoto could exercise some political influence over government officials to realize the cultural center. Kabayama occupied a similarly influential position in the business world.

Rockefeller made known that he was ready to donate 240 million yen to the international house on the condition that Japanese side would provide 100 million yen to “match” his contribution. The Japanese committee succeeded in raising more than 100 million yen from more than 7,000 companies and 5,000 individuals. It acquired a site measuring approximately 10,000 square meters at a special price from the Ministry of Finance. The Rockefeller Foundation provided not only the initial capital to establish the International House of Japan, but also grants for operations. I-House received U.S. \$70,000 in each of its first five years, and U.S.\$25,000 in each of the next five years, from the Rockefeller Foundation. Located in the Roppongi district in the heart of Tokyo, with accommodations facilities and program staff, the International House of Japan became the only institution that conducted organized intellectual exchange programs in Japan

for nearly twenty years, until the Japanese government established the Japan Foundation in 1972.

Similar to the British Council in the U.K. and the Goethe Institute in Germany, the Japan Foundation is a specialized organ of the government that is considered to be relatively independent from the government's daily diplomacy. Through the years of postwar recovery and the era of high economic growth, ordinary Japanese were preoccupied with daily survival and the reconstruction of industry and the national economy. They had little time to think about cultural exchange with foreign countries, and funds to pay the cost of such exchange were quite scarce. It was only the International House of Japan that could engage in this endeavor, thanks largely to very generous financial assistance by the American philanthropy. In those days American philanthropy alone had the capacity to realize long-term, well organized exchange programs in Japan. American philanthropic organizations and their Japanese partners almost monopolized organized programs for international cultural relations in the 1950s and 1960s. However, it should also be noted that since the San Francisco Peace Treaty excluded the Soviet Union and its allies, scholarship and fellowship programs with the Socialist block could not be conducted formally, and cultural exchange nearly came to a standstill, but Moscow tried to influence Japanese intellectuals through communist party relations and other channels. Its efforts sometimes bore fruit, and Soviet influence over academics, students, and labor movements occasionally overwhelmed American influence.

American private foundations initiated organized fellowship programs in Japan in the 1950s, utilizing the International House of Japan as the organizational basis of the program. The U.S.-Japan Intellectual Interchange Committee, of which Japanese members overlap with the International House committee members, inaugurated the intellectual exchange program that Rockefeller recommended in 1952. The information officer of the American Embassy, Saxton E. Bradford, said in an appeal to Rockefeller that intellectual exchange programs were necessary in order to keep Japan in the Free World, and only private foundations could create and sustain such programs. With a donation of 100,000 dollars, Rockefeller personally persuaded Columbia University to house an American Committee for Intellectual Interchange, with George Sansom, then a professor at Columbia, as the chair. The Intellectual Interchange Committee invited the participation of prominent people such as Oxford University Professor M. C. Darcey and Eleanor Roosevelt, and it sent to America and Europe such Japanese as women's rights activist and parliamentarian Ichikawa Fusae, philosopher and educationist Abe Yoshishige, and journalist and critic Hasegawa Nyozekean⁷.

During the first decade of the International House, its event planners invited a number of internationally renowned intellectuals, mainly from America and Europe, to appear. Among the guests were architect Walter Gropius, historian Arnold Toynbee, and development economist Karl Gunnar Myrdal. Asians who were invited included Indian development economist Mahalanobis and Minister of Finance Deshmukh. These Indian guests were partners of the Rockefeller and the Ford Foundations, which were deeply involved in development assistance in India and elsewhere in the Third World. Other Asians were invited to Japan as fellows, as well, and virtually all of them were recruited from the network of American foundations.

(3) Fellowships for Japanese directly managed by the Rockefeller Foundation

The Rockefeller Foundation had been operating in Japan since before World War II, starting with provision of emergency assistance to the victims of the Great Kanto Earthquake in 1923 that killed over 140,000 residents of Tokyo and surrounding areas. The Foundation has traditionally operated world-wide, supporting works in natural science, medicine, and nursing, and we can find cases of its giving grants in these fields before World War II. After the war, in addition to the above-mentioned cultural relations program centered at the International House of Japan, the Foundation also provided grants to individuals and academic institutions, especially universities, all over Japan. The activities of the Foundation are informed by a belief in individual talents, which is sometimes characterized as elitism. The Foundation seems to prefer supporting those it identifies as “the best of the best” to creating a broad-based cadre of professionals in specific fields. By contrast, the Ford Foundation, another internationally active American foundation, often seeks to foster the development of larger numbers of grantees, apparently in the expectation that this will produce a much larger program impact.

A directory of Japanese recipients of fellowships and scholarships between 1917 and 1970 lists 491 academics and intellectuals.⁸ Specialists in medical and natural sciences, including nursing, comprise the largest number, 282 fellows (57%), and students of the humanities and social sciences obtained 119 fellowships (24%). The remaining 90 fellowships (19%) were given to agricultural scientists. Not all of the 491 names are well known today, but in the field of political science, almost everyone is familiar with such great scholars as Kosaka Masataka, Mushakoji Kinhide, and Sakamoto Yoshikazu. Only three fellowships were given in the field of drama, but Fukuda Tsuneari, a great literary critic, and Ariyoshi Sawako, a famous woman writer, are there. It seems clear that the directory is an all-star list of post-war Japanese academics and intellectuals.

The impact of fellowship programs cannot be denied, considering the general influence of the many eminent fellows. It is hard to specify concretely, however, just what the actual impact was. The impact could be complex, not definite, not oriented in a single direction. For example, the political scientists mentioned above are not all considered to be pro-America. Some of them are actually considered politically left, and they have sometimes been quite critical of American foreign policy and Cold War strategy. The American foundations seem to have calculated that it was beneficial to have foreign intellectuals know America well; if grantees expressed criticism of American policies, that did not always hamper American interest abroad, but was healthy in the long run. In those days the atmosphere surrounding philanthropies was in general more generous and had more reserves of strength than at present, I suppose.

3. Strengthening Japan-U.S. relations: Japan-U.S. fellowships, 1960s–1980s

(1) Another Partner of American Philanthropy: The Japan Center for International Exchange and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations

As I mentioned earlier, American philanthropies active in post-World War II Japan, most notably the Rockefeller philanthropies and the Ford Foundation, had quite limited Japanese contacts. They repeatedly provided grants to the same organizations for different purposes. The International House of Japan was one and the Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE) headed by Yamamoto Tadashi was another. Yamamoto after four years of study in America joined Kosaka Tokusaburo, a liberal politician of Liberal Democratic Party, to implement an exchange program for Japanese and American educators that was jointly funded by the Ford Foundation and Japanese business. This project was Yamamoto's first collaboration with the Ford Foundation; his relationship with Ford would continue for decades. Next he organized a policy dialogue program for persons in the private sector, the Shimoda Conference; then he committed himself to building the Japan-U.S. Political Exchange Program, started in 1968, which has sent nearly 200 members of the U.S. Congress to Japan and 150 Japanese parliamentarians to America. This fellowship program is special because of its targeting of legislators as individuals. Through its operation and the personal relationships with politicians it has cultivated, JICE has attained an influential position.⁹

Yamamoto established JCIE in 1970, using a small apartment room as his office. For him to keep JCIE alive, it was essential that the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Ford Foundation continuously support him with general support grants. From 1971 to 1975, he served the Ford Foundation as a consultant. The JCIE created an alternative to

the International House of Japan, which had been only vehicle for implementing the ideas of American philanthropies. While the International House was shaped by the style of old liberals like its president Matsumoto, who always tried to keep distance from politics and avoid involvement in government business and liked to be associated with academics and other politically neutral intellectuals, Yamamoto and his JCIE actively sought contact with politicians and government officials and were not averse to exercising influence in policy matters. By the 1970s, for their changing purposes, American philanthropies might have needed both the academic and idealistic International House and the pragmatic and policy-oriented JCIE.

The JCIE has sponsored quite a number of exchange programs, conferences, research projects, and publications. Its major partners were American individuals and organizations, but JCIE also developed exchange programs with Europe, Australia, South Korea, and ASEAN countries. However, it was always on the American side in the Cold War and it never involved itself in exchanges with the communist bloc or non-aligned countries. Sometimes JCIE invited Asians to Japan, but always those Asian grant recipients had to be able to communicate in English, and most of them were American-trained people. Quite a lot of exchange programs, including fellowships, were conducted, but effectively the door was closed to those outside the sphere of American influence.

(2) Creation of the Japan Foundation: Reinforcing Japan-U.S. relations by the Japanese government in the 1970s

In 1972, the Japanese Diet passed a special Japan Foundation Act. It is said that this foundation was modeled on the British Council, but in fact it more closely resembles the prewar KBS¹⁰ in terms of purpose of establishment and its actual programs. The Japan Foundation supports Japanese language learning and Japanese studies abroad, it carries out or provides support for intellectual exchange and other types of exchange programs, and it conducts art exchange programs. Currently the Foundation has twenty two cultural centers and two branch offices in twenty-four overseas cities.

The establishment of the Japan Foundation was motivated by Japanese government's frustrations with tensions in Japan-U.S. relations that began to emerge in successive trade conflicts in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Especially, Japanese were shocked by Nixon's sudden visit to communist China and restoration of diplomatic relations without consulting the Japanese government in advance. Japan quickly followed the U.S. in establishing diplomatic relations with China, but the feeling of being treated lightly was undeniable. In the face of such developments, the Japanese

government decided that cultural programs could be used to reinforce Japan-U.S. relations. In the early 1970s, Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei's visits to Indonesia and Thailand had sparked violent anti-Japan demonstrations in Jakarta and Bangkok. A burgeoning influx of Japanese products into Southeast Asian markets made local people feel that a second (to World War II) Japanese invasion had started, and concepts such as neo-colonialism and cultural imperialism, which seemed to explain the situation, became fashionable. In Japan people tried to understand this sudden upsurge of anti-Japanese sentiment by invoking the same cultural conflict theory and this fueled the argument in support of expanding the role of the Japan Foundation.

The Japan Foundation administers several fellowship programs. The biggest is the Abe Fellowship, named for late Foreign Minister Abe Shintaro, run by the Center for Global Partnership (CGP), an ancillary organization of the foundation. The Social Science Research Council (SSRC) agreed to function as the coordinating organization for Abe Fellowships on the American side. This program does not target pure academics, but gives preference to more policy-oriented researchers. The very concept of establishing the CGP is rooted in the desire to help Japanese and Americans work together on global issues. In that the "fellowship" concept theoretically assumes equal partnership, it seems perfectly suited to the mission of the CGP. However, in reality it seems clear now after two decades of its activities that this partnership concept remains primarily a mere wish of the Japanese side. The Japan Foundation also has supported a few fellowship programs that target Southeast Asia, but it has preferred to support private programs rather than to implement the program by itself.

4. Creating a favorable epistemic community: The Nitobe Fellowship by the Ford Foundation and the International House of Japan

The Ford Foundation started grant-making activities in the early 1950s and has been very much internationally oriented and involved in third-world development, including Asia. The Foundation has favored India the most, spending millions of dollars for agricultural and other development projects there. The Ford Foundation was active also in Middle East and Southeast Asia (Burma and Indonesia) in the 1950s. The selection of countries of operation echoed American government's Cold War policy. The countries given priority were those of leaders of the non-alignment movement, where the governments treated America and the Soviet Union equally and thus the superpowers were competing for influence, sometimes utilizing aid as a diplomatic instrument. The staffs of the international division of the Ford Foundation in its early

days were mostly former officials of the Truman administration.¹¹

The Ford Foundation's grant-making activities in Japan often touched off controversies and became the target of harsh criticism by the Japanese left wing. When the Ford Foundation showed interest in providing assistance to Kyoto University to establish a Center for Southeast Asian Studies and again when it offered a grant to Toyobunko, the archives of Asian texts associated with University of Tokyo, left-wing university staff and student groups raised noisy opposition, accusing the Ford Foundation of being an agent of the CIA or American cultural imperialism. Many Japanese scholars still remember these controversies. These accusations were mostly naïve and groundless, being based on misunderstanding of the nature of the Ford Foundation.¹²

However, it is true that the Ford Foundation's grants sometimes had political implications or impact that was more direct and obvious than the Rockefeller philanthropies. For example, the controversy surrounding its support to Congress of Cultural Freedom (CCF) in Germany is famous. It is not well known, however, that its influence reached as far as Japan. In the early 1960s, Passin approached Ishihara Hoki, who worked for a politician of the rightist faction (social democratic faction) of the Japan Socialist Party, and invited him to join in the activities of the CCF. He proposed to pay Ishihara a salary that would have been higher than that of the prime minister. Ishihara became the Japan correspondent of the CCF and tried to organize a group of scholars to offer opposition to a leftwing group, the Democratic Scientists Association, that was under strong influence of Moscow. Later the people he recruited decided to organize an independent group rather than the branch of the CCF, and they established the Japan Cultural Forum. The Forum published an academic journal, *Jiyu* (Freedom). In those days in Japanese academic circles, Marxists and other leftist scholars had very strong influence and left extremists controlled the student movement. So radical was the far left of the student movement, people considered the student members of the Japan Communist Party to be a moderate faction. In such an atmosphere, liberal intellectuals were regarded as pro-American right, that is, as conservative, and the left severely attacked them. The Japan Cultural Forum was caricatured as a group of conservative scholars, although in reality they were a mixture of liberals and social democrats, Japanese cultural centrists, and traditionalists. However it may have been regarded by the radicals of the 1960s, for decades the Japan Cultural Forum functioned as one of the intellectual cores of anti-communist scholars and writers.¹³

The Ford Foundation had some relations with the International House of Japan in early 1960s. For example, it provided a grant to I-House to organize a group of scholars

and compile a history of Japanese labor movements. This project started with a suggestion of a member of the U.S. Embassy staff in Tokyo who found existing versions of Japanese labor history to be one-sided, dominated by the view of communists. He proposed to compile Japanese labor history from the viewpoint of American labor historians. The representative of the Ford Foundation approached the local leaders of International House of Japan and asked them to organize a team of scholars who had done research in American labor history. I-House coordinated the project, covering costs with funds from the Ford Foundation. This was the first encounter between I-House and Ford.¹⁴ A few grants for minor things followed.

In 1970s the Ford Foundation again approached the International House of Japan, proposing a new fellowship program. This time, the Ford Foundation wanted to “internationalize” Japanese social scientists. Japanese social scientists, in the opinion of the American philanthropic organization, had too few international contacts and made fewer contributions to international scholarship than they should. They seldom wrote in languages other than their own. Human contacts were limited. It was accurate to say that Japanese social sciences at that time were not “internationalized,” whether or not the Ford Foundation was justified in arguing that they *should* internationalize.

In early 1974 the Ford Foundation opened a Japan office. Carl Green, the Representative of the Foundation and a former student of Ambassador Reischauer, immediately went to Matsumoto Shigeharu, Maeda Yoichi, and Kato Mikio of the International House and asked for advice. A plan for starting a fellowship program to help create a cadre of Japanese social scientists who could work internationally emerged from their discussions. It is not clear which party actually had this idea; however, according to Kato’s memory, Maeda, a famous scholar of French philosophy and professor of University of Tokyo, was a strong supporter of it. Maeda was quite negative about the “closed” atmosphere of Japanese universities, and having spent a long period of study abroad himself, he believed foreign exposure to be extremely important for young Japanese social scientists. He was also concerned that Japanese social scientists and humanities scholars participated less in and contributed less to international dialogue on academic issues than their natural science colleagues. After several consultations with prominent Japanese social scientists, Green and Kato went to the U.S. and visited the Social Sciences Research Council and the campuses of Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Michigan, Chicago, Stanford, and the University of California, Berkeley. They designed a fellowship for young (under thirty-six) social scientists with a duration of two years of study at a foreign university or research institute. The official name of the program they created was the Social Science International Fellowship, but it was

known popularly as Nitobe Fellowship,¹⁵ after Nitobe Inazo, a famous prewar educator and internationalist who, as Under Secretary-General of the League of Nations, enthusiastically supported the 1922 establishment of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. The people of the International House hoped that this fellowship program would help foster the next generation of Nitobes.

It may have been a coincidence that in 1975 the OECD conducted a study of the social sciences in Japan. The OECD conducted similar researches in other member countries, France and Norway. The OECD team's major concern was whether present social sciences and scientists were contributing to government's policy-making or social reform in general. They questioned social sciences' practical contribution to the society. It was acknowledged even in the 1970s that this pragmatic view of social science was very much American, and did not reflect different traditions of social sciences in other countries. Invited to comment on the OECD report, Yano Toru, a professor of political science of Kyoto University, acknowledged the pragmatic bias of the OECD's study team, but he supported the idea of changing Japanese social sciences in the direction of behavioral science.¹⁶

It is interesting that Hirano Ken'ichiro recalls this 1975 report and Yano's comments and concludes that the OECD study itself look odd, as the report and its recommendations failed to produce positive impacts. Behavioral science has faded, and seems to have been a kind of academic fashion, and although the Japanese government invited a limited number of social scientists to serve on its policy committees or even in cabinet posts, their contribution as scientists is questionable; unsurprisingly, government tends to recruit only those who support government policy. Hirano thinks that people expect social scientists to provide the public with various viewpoints and criticism of government policies. That, he argues, is actually the basic role or possible contribution of the social sciences. He also recalls that among scholars at the time, it was rumored that the Ministry of Education or the government was the real player behind the OECD study and basically devised the framework of the report.¹⁷

We can hardly leap to the conclusion that an international plot was afoot, but it could be said that there were parties in various sectors, Japanese government, academia, and intellectuals, that regarded the state of the social sciences in Japan as a problem, as it was strongly influenced by left-oriented scholars who always opposed government and the capitalist system and nurtured young men and women who brought an angry and violent spirit to the student movement. And the very fact that the OECD has played a role to help reform social sciences to fit existing regimes and political economies of member countries, indicates that there were parties in Japan that

were of the same opinion as the OECD (or the U.S. government, which was dominant in OECD). In other words, it is probable that a consensus existed among a certain segment of OECD leaders and intellectuals that social sciences in Japan and other countries should be reformed. And, we can say that the International House of Japan, a forum of Japanese liberal scholars and intellectuals, and the Ford Foundation shared this consensus.

It was expected that the Fellowship program would send 100 young Japanese social scientists abroad within ten years, and they would constitute a substantial cadre that would further develop personal networks with Western scholars. The Ford Foundation was willing to provide one million dollars for this program, but the International House had to find a matching fund partner. Fortunately, the newly born Toyota Foundation was looking for opportunities for its international program and agreed to pay the other half of the cost. The Toyota Foundation joined the consortium with the additional aim of learning methods of grant-making from the Ford Foundation. In fact the Toyota Foundation did not agree fully with the original intention of the fellowship, and requested a few years later that the International House include non-Western countries in the program coverage. Because of this request, a few Asian or African studies experts are to be found on the list of fellows; they stayed for one or two years at universities in Asia or Africa. The Toyota Foundation's request modified the concept of this fellowship program, greatly expanding the territory within which young Japanese social scientists could be "fellows."¹⁸

The Nitobe Fellowship program was terminated in 2007. Despite the Toyota Foundation's initiative, a majority of the 170 Japanese social scientists who had obtained two years academic leave from their home institutions to gain exposure at foreign universities or other academic institutions went to the U.S., the U.K., and European countries. Eighty-eight young scholars went to the U.S. and thirty-seven studied at British universities. Only three scholars stayed at the former Soviet Academy, and all of them combined one year stay at an American university and another at the Academy, suggesting that they applied the approach of Western Soviet studies. Most likely, American universities accepted them as "fellows" and they went to the Soviet Union for data collection. Another three scholars went to China between 1983 and 1985. Their areas of specialization were language, anthropology, and agricultural economy.¹⁹

The list of 170 fellows includes many famous professors. Some of them later became university presidents or presidents of academic associations. People consider the Nitobe Fellowship very prestigious, perhaps more so than the Fulbright fellowship. A two-year fellowship is a luxury for an academician, and the fellows praise the institutional support

and services they received from the International House and its counterparts in their host countries. The fellows could have utilized two years exclusively for research, discussion, and other academic activities, without any obligation, but also they had the opportunity to establish everlasting personal trust with colleagues in foreign countries. After their fellowship periods ended, many of them enthusiastically welcomed foreign colleagues to come to their home institutions as “fellows.” Thus the multiplier effect of the fellowship program for academic network creation was tremendous.

The Nitobe Fellowship contributed to create an international network of social scientists in Japan and the Western countries, and it encouraged Japanese social scientists to internationally contribute to the development of learning. However, as I mentioned earlier, “fellowship” has two aspects, inclusive and exclusive. The inclusive aspect of the Nitobe Fellowship was that it connected Japanese academia more closely with Western scholarship in terms of human networks, commonalities of approach and methodologies, and academic language in the social sciences. But, at the same time, Japanese social scientists came to feel more distance from scholars of their Eastern neighbors the Soviet Union and China. The gap between Japanese and Chinese scholarship became wider, and Japanese traditional scholarship also began to look outdated to the generation of Japanese scholars who had drawn closer to Western scholarship.

5. Rebalancing the relationship with Asia by Japanese Foundations in the post-Cold War era, 1990s–2000s

When the post-Cold War period started in 1990s, Japanese foundations seemed to look for alternative directions for their fellowship programs. Some major international foundations looked for Asia. This phenomenon makes me feel that Japanese philanthropies are trying to rebalance Japan’s foreign relations, which are perceived to have been leaning excessively on America. A common feature of recent fellowship programs of Japanese foundations is multilateralism. Such programs cover a region and fellows can choose any country within that region, not necessarily Japan, although the funding comes from the Japanese foundations. This feature suggests that these programs have the prospect of regional integration—something like the European Union—in mind. But they also have a common serious problem. All of them are targeting Southeast Asian countries, especially former American block countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, and they do not include Korea and China in their fellowship program coverage. Prewar experiences still hamper

cultural relations among the three countries of East Asia, and the legacy of the Cold War structure of intellectual “fellow” vs. “stranger” still prevails, especially in the case of China. Because of limitation of space, I will take up two examples only, but it should be noted that other programs like the Asia Leadership Fellowship jointly conducted by the International House and the Japan Foundation have similar importance and share these post-Cold War features.

The movement was initiated by the Toyota Foundation, Ford’s partner for the Nitobe Fellowship. The Toyota Foundation started the Southeast Asian Studies Regional Exchange Program (SEASREP) in 1992, and then expanded it to a multilateral exchange program in 1995, covering four countries; Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand. Through SEASREP young researchers from these four countries have obtained opportunities to go to other countries to study or conduct research. The very concept of the program is to support “Southeast Asian studies by Southeast Asians,” to redress the situation in which studies of this area were dominated by outsiders, Western scholars. ASEAN is on the way to integrating this region, and SEASREP seems to encourage this regional integration through intellectual and academic “fellowship” relationship and network building. Started and funded until 2014 by the Toyota Foundation, and since 1995 jointly supported by the Japan Foundation, the program has its own independent management committee and a secretariat stationed in the Philippines. In order to facilitate exchange programs, eight universities in the region signed a multilateral agreement of cooperation in 1996. Already more than 500 young researchers have crossed borders and had opportunities to widen their human network in the region.²⁰

It should be noted here that the Toyota Foundation implemented its activities in Southeast Asia in close collaboration with prominent scholars of Southeast Asian studies in the region, many of whom had earned their higher degrees from Western universities such as Cornell University. In addition, Japanese advisors of the Toyota’s Southeast Asian programs mainly came from Kyoto University’s Center for Southeast Asian Studies, which, as I mentioned earlier, a controversial Ford Foundation grant helped to establish in the 1970s. Therefore, we can say that the Toyota Foundation has utilized an already existing network of Southeast Asian Studies experts in Asian countries, a network largely prepared by American government and philanthropies a few decades ago. It could also be said that Japanese philanthropy functioned within a framework constructed in accordance with American Cold War strategy. The purpose of Japanese philanthropic activities seems different from that of the Americans, however, even though it is not so clearly articulated yet.

The move was followed by the Nippon Foundation, a unique foundation with income from speedboat race gambling. It is the largest mechanism for making charitable contributions from funds derived from publicly run gambling, and it has been keen in international grant-making. Especially, it has been known for many years for providing assistance for eradication of infectious diseases, including leprosy and smallpox.

The Asian Public Intellectuals Fellowship Program (API) is the only intellectual program of the Nippon Foundation while other international programs focus on development issues such as poverty eradication, health or environment. The foundation stresses the concept of “public intellectuals” as the qualification for API fellows. As “public intellectuals,” the foundation means to identify persons who have social concerns and intellectual influence, not academics who are absorbed in details of their own narrow specializations. The target group of the fellowship encompasses a wide range of people—social scientists, journalists, NGO activists, and artists. The community of “public intellectuals” who are concerned with not only national problems, but also regional or global problems and who can bridge the gap between the global and the local has been pursued.

The API program covered mainly five countries, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Japan, each of which has a country coordinating office associated with a university or a research institute and provided small number of fellowships to Indochinese countries. The central office is located at the Kyoto University Center for Southeast Asian Studies. The institutional structure and geographic coverage resemble those of SEASREP, but API includes Japan. Within fifteen years starting from 2000, the API produced 333 fellows, roughly sixty fellows from each of the five participating countries. Evaluations of the API program show that the fellows highly rate the value of their experiences.²¹

6. Conclusion—Still lacking “fellowship”: Japan’s difficulty with Korea and China

Fellowship programs during the Cold War period, designed and financed by the American government and the philanthropies, contributed a lot to increase the number of Japanese who became “fellows” of the Western academic scholarship and institutions. On the other side of the coin, however, in these years Japanese lost contact with its own former fellows, Chinese and Korean scholars. After becoming Americanized or Westernized, many Japanese scholars have found it difficult to accept Chinese and Korean scholars as their academic peers. By the Western standards that they had (over-)learned, Japanese judged Chinese and Korean scholarship’s level to be not equal

to western scholars to accept them as fellows at Japanese institutions. In addition there are many issues on which there is disagreement, such as perceptions of history and in the case of China democratic values and human rights issues. However, despite of all these difficulties or perhaps because of them, continuing earnest effort is required. Just after the end of the occupation, who imagined that so many Japanese would become academic fellows of American institutions? Could John D. Rockefeller III really imagine the Japan-U.S. cultural relationship that exists today? Perhaps, no. But he made a plan and invested his own and his foundation's money to implement it and succeed. Now might be the time for Japanese philanthropies to initiate their own Rockefeller plan for betterment of Japan-China and Japan-Korea cultural relations. They could design and implement fellowship programs that specifically address China and Korea, with the aim of making Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans academic and intellectual fellows, cooperative and mutually supportive for the advancement of learning.

Notes

- 1 Hirano Ken'ichiro, 'In Search of Fellowship Program in the New Age,' in International House of Japan, "Looking for International Intellectual Exchange in the New Age: Social Science International Fellowship and Its Products, Problems, and Perspectives," International House of Japan, 2008 (in Japanese).
- 2 Kagehide Kaku and Kenichiro Hirano eds., *Commemorating 50 Years of the Japan-U.S. Fulbright Program: Japan and International Intellectual Exchanges in the 21st Century*, The Japan Times, 2003.
- 3 Igarashi, Takeshi "Initiation of Postwar Japan-U.S. Cultural Exchange Plan," in Ikado, Fujio ed., *Occupation and Japanese Religion*, pp. 119–142, Miraisha, 1993 (in Japanese).
- 4 Kato, Mikio, ed. *50 Years of the International House of Japan*, International House of Japan, 2002 (in Japanese).
- 5 While the U.S. government had to deal with people who might have political influence regardless of their ideological orientation, private foundations could be straightforward in showing favor or disfavor to people's ideas.
- 6 "Japanese-American Cultural Relations: Proposal for a Cultural Center and Student International Houses," Rockefeller Archives Center, Record Group 1.2, Series 609, Box 1, Folder 6.
- 7 Kato, Mikio, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–33.
- 8 "Rockefeller Foundation, Directory of Fellowships and Scholarships, 1917–1970," Rockefeller Archives Center.
- 9 Japan Center for International Exchange, "Twenty Five Years Anniversary Report," 1995 (in Japanese) .
- 10 Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, established in 1933, was a semi-governmental organization aimed at international cultural exchange. Liberal intellectuals led the movement to establish KBS, but later the foreign ministry controlled its policy and activities and it became merely a propaganda organ during the latter half of World War II.

- 11 Makita, Toichi, "The Ford Foundation in Forming International Development Regime," 2006 (doctoral dissertation in Japanese, unpublished).
- 12 This observation of mine is based on the study of archives of these projects, available at the Ford Foundation Archives.
- 13 Jomaru, Yoichi, "A study about Japanese conservative journals, *Shokun* and *Seiron*," *Asahi Inquiry & Research*, 2006.1, No. 188 and 2003.2, No. 189 (in Japanese).
- 14 This paragraph is also based on my archival study of this project files at the Ford Foundation Archives.
- 15 Kato, *op. cit.*
- 16 OECD Study Team, *Criticizing Japanese Social Sciences*, with comments by Yano Toru, Kodansha, 1975 (in Japanese translation).
- 17 International House of Japan, *op. cit.*
- 18 Toyota Foundation, *The Toyota Foundation: Thirty Years of History 1974-2004*, the Toyota Foundation, 2007.
- 19 International House of Japan, *op. cit.*
- 20 The Toyota Foundation, *op. cit.*
- 21 Baker, Chris, "Evaluation of the API Fellowship Program for The Nippon Foundation" (unpublished internal report submitted to the Nippon Foundation).

References

- Abe, Hiroshi (2004) *A Study about 'Cultural Works Project for China'*, Kyuko Shoin. (in Japanese)
- Baker, Chris (2007) "Evaluation of the API Fellowship Program for The Nippon Foundation." (An unpublished internal report submitted to the Nippon Foundation.)
- Igarashi, Takeshi (1993) "Initiation of Postwar Japan-US Cultural Exchange Plan," in Ikado, Fujio ed., *Occupation and Japanese Religion*, pp. 119-142, Miraisha. (in Japanese)
- International House of Japan (2008) "Looking for International Intellectual Exchange in the New Age: Social Science International Fellowship and Its Products, Problems, and Perspectives," International House of Japan. (in Japanese)
- Jomaru, Yoichi (2006) "A study about Japanese conservative journals, *Shokun* and *Seiron*" *Asahi Inquiry & Research*, 2006.1, No. 188 and 2003.2 No.189. (in Japanese)
- Kato, Mikio, ed. (2002) *50 Years of the International House of Japan*, International House of Japan. (in Japanese)
- Katsumata, Hideko (2006) "Japanese Philanthropy's Origins and Impact," in Yamamoto, Tadashi, et.al. eds., *Philanthropy and Reconciliation: Rebuilding Postwar U.S.-Japan Relations*, Japan Center for International Exchange.
- Kimura, Masato (2006) "U.S.-Japan Business Networks and Prewar Philanthropy," in Yamamoto, Tadashi, et.al. eds., *Philanthropy and Reconciliation: Rebuilding Postwar U.S.-Japan Relations*, Japan Center for International Exchange.
- Makita, Toichi (2006) "The Ford Foundation in Forming International Development Regime," (doctoral dissertation in Japanese, unpublished.)
- Makita, Toichi, (2007) "Creation and Management of Grant Program," in Japan Foundation Center ed., *Innovation of Private Grant-making*, Japan Foundation Center. (in Japanese)
- OECD Study Tteam (1975) *Criticizing Japanese Social Sciences*, with comments by Yano Toru, Kodansha. (in

Japanese translation)

Shibazaki, Atsushi (1999) *Modern Japan and International Cultural Exchange: Establishment and Development of Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai*, Yushindo. (in Japanese)

Takeuchi, Yoshimi (1966) *Japan and Asia*, Chikuma Shobo. (in Japanese)

Toyota Foundation (2007) *The Toyota Foundation: Thirty Years of History 1974-2004*, the Toyota Foundation.