International Relations of the Asia-Pacific Volume 12 (2012) 161–192
doi:10.1093/irap/lcr017 Advance Access published on 7 September 2011

Rockefeller, Carnegie, and the limits of American hegemony in the emergence of Australian international studies

James Cotton*

Humanities and Social Sciences, Australian Defence Force Academy, University of New South Wales, Canberra, Australia
**E-mail: j.cotton@adfa.edu.au*

Received 11 April 2011; Accepted 2 August 2011

Abstract

This essay contributes to the emerging debate on the origins of international studies, focusing on evidence regarding Australia. While neither Carnegie nor Rockefeller had a primary interest in international studies, the largest US foundations had a major impact on the emergence of the subject in Australia ca. 1920–60. This impact was direct, through the provision of funding to individuals (via fellowships) as well as to organizations; it was also indirect by virtue of the support given to the Institute of Pacific Relations (a proportion of which was actually for specific Australian purposes). How this impact is to be characterized turns in part on methodological questions; it cannot however be seen as a clear case of the imposition of Gramscian-style hegemony in the realm of ideas. The most apparent influence of the foundations was to direct the attention of a selected body of Australian intellectuals, of sometimes diverse views, beyond Empire to transnational concerns.

International Relations of the Asia-Pacific Vol. 12 No. 1

In the last decade, the foundational myth of the international relations (IR) discipline has come under sustained attack. Traditional claims that the progress of early international studies was marked by a major debate between realist and utopian readings have been shown to be historically tendentious (Ashworth, 2006); some scholars have argued that attention to the relationship between conceptions of internationalism and of imperialism is of much greater importance if the ideas of the 1920s to the 1940s are to be properly understood (Long and Schmidt, 2005). In addition to reassessing the earlier writings in the disciplinary canon, work on the archaeology of international studies has begun to show that attention to the institutions that fostered, housed, and supported early work in the field throws new light on the development of the discipline (Guilhot, 2007; Riemans, 2010; Rietzler, 2011). This article, subjecting to close analysis extensive historical materials not previously examined, focuses upon the record of institutional support provided by major American philanthropic foundations to international studies in Australia prior to the 1960s. It then situates this record in relation to scholarly debates on the characterization of foundation influence in the social sciences, in which field the Gramscian approach has been influential. The evidence considered facilitates a reassessment of the relative impact of British and of American influences, suggesting also that the range of work in Australia, especially its concern with the Pacific, cannot be explained entirely in terms of a hegemonic reproduction of American values and perspectives, despite that view being expounded by a number of scholars.

The initial phase of the development of international studies in Australia – during the period from the 1920s through to around 1960 – coincides with the greatest philanthropic activity of the Carnegie and Rockefeller organizations, the wider influence of which diminished as other sources of funding made their appearance and as the organizations themselves became more selective in their aims. Strategies for locating international studies and the emerging IR discipline in Australia at this time include tracing the careers of individuals whose work, teaching, and publications were prominent in the field, and focusing on those institutions devoted to analysis and education in international affairs. Both of these routes tend to lead to the same destination. The community of foreign policy intellectuals before World War II consisted of perhaps 30 key individuals, most of whom held multiple memberships in the few

organizations in the field. This article reviews the activities of some of these individuals, identifying episodes in their professional careers where Carnegie and Rockefeller support had an impact, and assessing the importance of that impact. The role of the foundations in the evolution of the Australian Institute of International Affairs (AIIA – as it became known in 1933), the most important organization of its kind, is then considered. Finally, an estimate is attempted of the extent to which international studies in Australia was shaped or framed by foundation funding, in light of the claims advanced in scholarship on British and American organizations and scholars active in the same period.

1 Locating international studies

If the activities of institutions are used as a guide to the sites relevant to early international studies, then the AIIA was the pre-eminent national institution through to the 1950s (Legge, 1999). The advent of the Institute was a direct response to the formation of the League of Nations (Hudson, 1980) and the fact that Australia was a founder member. Australian officials were present at the meeting in Paris from which both the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) ultimately emerged, and they carried the new internationalism and its mode of institutional organization back to their home country. Through the AIIA publication series, the presence of its members at international gatherings and by way of its connections with the world of policy making, the Institute had no rivals. The AIIA became embedded in a network of institutions that had a pervasive internationalizing influence. The Institute served as the Australian node of the international network of the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), which can be described as the organization that pioneered the Asia-Pacific as a discrete and comprehensive intellectual and policy construct (Hooper 1994; Holland, 1995), thereby opening Australian international studies to trans-Pacific and non-imperial discourses. The RIIA, its US equivalent the CFR, the IPR, the AIIA, and the other dominion-based institutes engaged in complex and often institutionalized networking; in particular, this networking facilitated funding possibilities when the major US philanthropic foundations turned their attention to fostering international understanding by way of promoting international studies. This network operated as much on the basis of personal

acquaintance as on disciplinary sympathies. Other organizations of relevance in Australia, including The League of Nations Union and Round Table, were also concerned with international affairs, though in most cases the memberships of these groups were co-extensive.

The discipline of IR as a university subject in Australia emerged soon after its appearance in the Anglophone metropoles. The incubating disciplines were Law and History (with some assistance from geography and economics); it should be recalled that, at this time, the work of historians often included the analysis of contemporary events. Given the relatively small number at the time both of academics and of students, individual figures can be identified and influences can be fairly easily traced. It may be asserted that the father of Australian IR was William Harrison Moore; the evidence for his internationalist outlook includes his strong commitment to the League of Nations (Cotton, 2009a). At Melbourne, his course 'International Relations and Law' gave a treatment to the subject recognizable from the point of view of the modern discipline, and his students, among them W. K. Hancock and Fred Alexander, were the leading figures in the subject in the following generation.

At Melbourne, IR began in the Law Faculty. From his appointment in 1893, Professor William Harrison Moore taught widely across his discipline. In 1918, he introduced a new course, 'Modern Political Institutions', one part of which was concerned with 'International Relations and Law'. This specific part (ultimately consisting of 47 lectures) was Australia's first course in 'international relations'. It entailed an exposition of international politics combining recent international history, especially on the origins of the Great War, and which dealt also with alliances, the balance of power, treaties, and concluding with international organization. After 1927 and Harrison Moore's official retirement, the course continued to be offered, with P.D. Phillips, who had been Moore's student, as instructor; in 1932, he was joined by W. Macmahon Ball.

The situation in Sydney may be contrasted with that in Melbourne. A.H. Charteris assumed the Challis chair of international law and jurisprudence at the University of Sydney in 1921. Though he had wide interests in international law and relations, his approach to his specialty was more specifically legalistic (Charteris, 1940). IR was also fostered in Sydney through the extension work of Sydney University. Between 1921 and 1925, there were Workers' Educational Association (WEA) tutorial

classes at Sydney specifically on 'international relations', taught by H. Duncan Hall, a Sydney and Oxford graduate who had just published a major study, *The British Commonwealth of Nations* (1920), which had its origins as a Fabian Society study. In his contemporary curriculum vitae, Hall described himself as 'Tutorial Class Lecturer in International Relations' (NLA, MS 5547).

It cannot be coincidental that of all the topics they might have addressed in their early teaching careers, Moore's students, Hancock and Alexander, both tackled IR. In Western Australia, Fred Alexander was appointed to a history lectureship in late 1924. From 1926, he taught 'The History of European International Organisation, with Particular Reference to the League of Nations'. From this teaching and from the extra-mural work to which he devoted much energy emerged his 1928 book, *From Paris to Locarno and After* (1928), which was concerned with the search for security in Europe. He was later to serve as a delegate from Australia to the League of Nations Assembly in 1932. Meanwhile, the youthful Hancock had taken up the chair at Adelaide. As he was later to describe his teaching at that time: 'I was trying single-handed to cover the ground which belongs to a well-staffed university department of International Relations' (Hancock, 1954, p. 113). His 'International Relations' course prescribed the use of Alexander's book (University of Adelaide, 1932, p. 17). Upon his removal to Britain, Hancock received generous Carnegie funding. In Queensland, constitutional historian A.C. V. Melbourne made a distinguished contribution to international policy through his work on Australia's relations with Asia.

Finally, the world of policy also produced some influential figures in international studies. F.W. Eggleston was undoubtedly the most important (Osmond, 1985; Meaney, 2005), though independent contributions were made by J.G. Latham and E.L. Piesse (Meaney, 1996). In many respects, Eggleston occupies a position at least as important as that of Moore, and it is hardly coincidental that they were both friends and co-workers. After a career in Victorian state politics and service as a senior public official (including a role at the Paris peace talks of 1919), Eggleston became Australia's first diplomatic representative in China and later Minister in Washington. But again, as Eggleston was perhaps the most prominent figure in the Victorian AIIA and its predecessors, and also in the IPR, Latham was the first chair of the League of Nations Union (a position later taken by Harrison Moore), and Piesse was a

long-time contributor to the work of the AIIA, the sphere of policy making cannot be severed from the intellectual community already described. And this continuity remained for the careers of the next generation, with W. Macmahon Ball, a wartime public official and post-war an 'occasional diplomat' (Kobayashi, 2009), Fred Alexander working for R.G. Casey in Australia's Legation in Washington in 1940, and Walter Crocker serving in international organizations and later as an ambassador. Other figures mentioned below, including George Caiger, W.D. Forsyth, and John Burton also spent time in government bureaucracy. The world of policy was not severed from academic debate on international studies, as is largely the case in Australia today.

2 The IPR as a vehicle for foundation impact in Australia

The impact of the United States' foundations upon the most prominent members of the first generation of Australian scholars working in IR and international studies, namely W. Harrison Moore, A.H. Charteris, F.W. Eggleston, and H. Duncan Hall, was undoubtedly significant; in Eggleston's case, it was probably formative. All of these individuals, as a consequence of their membership of the forerunners of the AIIA and also, as a result, of the IPR, traveled in Asia and the Pacific, met regional scholars and officials, participated in IPR study projects, and also were exposed to the power of American ideas and organization. And the IPR would hardly have existed without big philanthropy; though the Institute did attract other sources of support, the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation were the Institute's most important paymasters, either directly or through such bodies as the Social Science Research Council. This situation is clear from any perusal of IPR records and is acknowledged in the extensive secondary literature (e.g. Hooper, 1994; Woods, 1999).

It is Akami's view that Edward C. Carter's privileged access to the foundations was the basis of his control of the IPR (Akami, 2002, p. 134). What impact did this funding and its sources have upon the work and outlooks of Australians? First, travel and other expenses for Australian delegations to the regular conferences of the IPR were met by the Institute; on occasion, specific funds were granted to ensure Australian participation. In 1931, for example, after reference to the RIIA

at Chatham House, $5,000 was found from the Special Fund for the expenses of the Australian and New Zealand delegations to China. (Memo, 22 September 1931: CCNY Series 3, Box 182, Folders 3–5). Again in 1933, the British Dominions and Colonies Fund provided $10,000 to support the conference of the IPR in Banff. The need to secure a good representation from the dominions is noted in the documentation, which specifically remarks on the 'negligible' contribution of Australia to the expenses of the IPR (Carter to Keppel, 4 October 1933: CCNY Series 3, Box 182, Folders 3–5). The latter point places the strategic impact of the Carnegie monies in perspective. Although the IPR groups in each country contributed a national subscription to the working costs of the organization, this sum was often nominal. In the years before World War II, the Australian contribution was never more than $625; correspondence shows that it was sometimes not paid in full or remitted late.

Thus, Duncan Hall attended the first IPR conference in Honolulu and also the second, Eggleston led the Australian delegation at the second conference (in Honolulu, where Persia Campbell was also present) and was accompanied at the third in Kyoto by Charteris, Persia Campbell, and Ian Clunies Ross. At the fourth conference in Shanghai, which met as Japanese and Chinese military forces clashed, Harrison Moore led the Australian group. Eggleston again chaired the Australian delegation at the sixth conference at Yosemite. In these years, the only Empire-focused meeting to which Australians from the AIIA traveled was the first unofficial conference on the Commonwealth, held in Toronto in 1933. Significantly, the Australian delegation consisted, in addition to A.H. Charteris, of those individuals who had come to North America for the Banff conference of the IPR in Canada.

Without further investigation, it would appear that the network of Empire institutes of international affairs, modeled on and affiliated with the RIIA, might be seen in these years to constitute a rival network of ideas and influence. This was not the case. The funding of the Toronto meeting provides a telling illustration of the reach of the foundations and, at one remove, of their impact on Australia. In the straitened circumstances of 1932, Chatham House was either unwilling or unable to fund the Canadian event. A proposal was sent to Carnegie by the RIIA Chair seeking assistance of £5,000 (RIIA Chair Neil Malcolm to Carnegie, 1 December 1932; Macadam to Keppel, same date: CCNY Series 3, Box70C, Folder 6, 'British Commonwealth Relations

Conference 1932–4'). The supporting documentation included a personal letter from the Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald. The reception given to this application indicated some embarrassment on the part of the trustees that the British should be so straitened as to need such support (Memo H.J. [James] to Keppel, 30 January 1933: CCNY, Series 3, Box 70C, Folder 6). In the event, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (CIIA) received $17,500, with £3,650 going direct to Chatham House, which managed the travel and expenses of the overseas delegates. In the draft budget, an estimated £942 is designated to pay for the attendance of five Australian delegates.

The Carnegie Corporation was equally generous with support for the second Commonwealth conference, which was hosted by the AIIA and held at Lapstone, outside Sydney. This was by far the most important IR gathering of its kind held in Australia to that date (and arguably since); the very senior UK delegation included Lord Lothian, Lionel Curtis, future Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, and, from the University of Birmingham, W.K. Hancock. Most Australian figures in the field attended, including Charteris, Eggleston, P.D. Phillips, W.G.K. Duncan, Ernest Scott, E.C. Dyason, and T.P. Fry. British funding came solely from the Rhodes Trust; the A£1,250 in question supported the visit of Lothian, who traveled by air and who, in addition, visited a number of state capitals where he attended to Rhodes undertakings and also delivered presentations (generally hosted by the AIIA) on international affairs (Cotton, 2008). Between the two governments, the federal and NSW governments provided A£5,000, this sum being matched by the Carnegie Corporation. It is clear that without Carnegie support the meeting would never have been convened; the Corporation was certainly furthering the agenda of Commonwealth solidarity. Carnegie also contributed generously to the post-war Commonwealth conferences.

The key figure in the Australian relationship with the IPR was F.W. Eggleston. His visit to Honolulu in 1927 under IPR aegis provided his first direct glimpse (aside from at the Paris Peace Conference) of the power of American organization and capital as well as his first exposure to scholars and public figures from Asia; his trip to Kyoto in 1929 was formative and is thus discussed briefly. There is little doubt that Eggleston was profoundly affected by his visit to Japan, his affection for the country persisting even when he lamented the later excesses of Japanese militarism (Akami, 2001). Travel by sea from Australia also

took in calls in Shanghai and Hong Kong en route. The IPR meeting in Kyoto was no ordinary affair (Condliffe, 1929). Eggleston served on the Pacific Council, the membership of which included such luminaries as Lionel Curtis and Lord Hailsham and on the Japanese side Baron Sakatani (a leading liberal and former Finance Minister) and Dr Nitobe Inazo (Johns Hopkins alumnus and former Under Secretary-General of the League of Nations). A.H. Charteris represented Australia on the Program Committee, assisted by Persia Campbell; in all, there were 11 Australian representatives at Kyoto. After a preparatory week, the conference proper ran from 29 October to 9 November, with many afternoons given over to cultural, social, and sightseeing activities. At its conclusion, most of the delegates, including Eggleston (accompanied by his wife and daughter), traveled by special train to Tokyo for three days of meetings and entertainments, including an 'Imperial Chrysanthemum Party' at the Palace, a luncheon given by the Finance Minister, and a Foreign Affairs Garden Party. The IPR expended upon international travel for the delegates the sum of $9,656.95 ('Detailed Report of 1929 Conference Finances': IPR U Hawaii, Box B-4/9, 'Conferences, Kyoto 1929').

Reporting to the members of the Australian Institute, Eggleston speaks in glowing terms of the eminence of the delegates and the seriousness with which the business of the conference was regarded, even while he complained that the emphasis on Far Eastern affairs in its proceedings did not permit the Australian delegation to use much of the material they had prepared in advance. In a very personal passage, having noted the advantages of contacts with the distinguished delegation from the UK (which included Arnold Toynbee), he observes:

> No less beneficial to Australians accustomed to an insular atmosphere, was the association with the Oriental delegations from the Philippines, China and Japan. Meeting men of culture and intellectual ability from races of widely different origin is an education, and the effect upon us has been to develop an impatience with the narrow racial intolerance which is so conspicuous in Australia today. ('Kyoto Conference 1929, Report of Chairman, Australian Delegation': IPR U Hawaii, Box A-6/9, Folder 1, 'Councils – Australia – 1926–49')

Eggleston was under no illusions regarding the minor role Australia was bound to play, as reflected in the miniscule support his national

committee could offer to the Institute: 'The difficulty is that we are working very far from centres of thought.' He was well aware, however, of the advantages of the IPR connection, reporting that he opposed 'strenuously' any plan to devolve research funding upon the various national committees.

A similar story could be told of W. Harrison Moore, who was the chair of the Australian group at the next IPR conference in China, originally to have been located in Hangzhou but moved to Shanghai after Japanese troops clashed with Chinese forces in the area. Moore was already at sea when the 'Mukden incident' occurred as were almost all the other national delegations, otherwise the event may not have been convened. Although well travelled in Europe and America, apart from ship-borne visits en route to Britain, Harrison Moore had never visited Asia until the IPR meeting of October–November 1931. After the conference, he took the opportunity, accompanied by his wife, also to go to Japan. Upon his return, Moore wrote enthusiastically of the profound effect upon him of exposure to the ideas, conditions, and scholars of 'the East' as a result of his experiences; as has been noted, a specific grant from Carnegie made these experiences possible ('IPR, Fourth Biennial Conference. Report of the Leader of the Australian Group': Harrison Moore Papers HM 11/3/11, Folder 'Institute of Pacific Relations'; Moore, 1932).

3 Fellows and fellowships

Having considered the impact of the Foundation-funded IPR on some earlier figures in the field, the focus will now shift to the Foundations as they had an impact directly on individual Australian scholars.

Another of the first generation whose fortunes and outlook were shaped by foundation influence was A.C.V. Melbourne. Though he is a somewhat neglected figure, in retrospect the work of A.C.V. Melbourne on Australia–Asia relations is in a class of its own. In an extensive report researched during an arduous field trip, he foretold the emergence of the Northeast Asian ascendancy, then worked tirelessly to awake a myopic government to the urgency of major policy adjustments. Melbourne was on the History staff of the University of Queensland from 1913, and remained there except for a period of war service. His academic prominence was greatly facilitated by acquiring a PhD at King's College as the

fruit of spending the years 1928–30 in London as a Rockefeller Fellow. A fine constitutional historian whose major book was the first to properly exploit British documents on Australia, in the Rockefeller records his field is recorded as 'political science' ('A C V Melbourne': RFA, RG10 Card Index, Social Science Fellowships). Melbourne was an active member of the AIIA, his contribution to the Institute's volume *Australian Foreign Policy 1934* (Dinning and Holmes, 1935) being the best and most forthright argument of the era on the need for a distinct national policy.

Had H. Duncan Hall remained in Sydney, international studies would probably have made a much more vigorous beginning. His teaching of 'international relations' for the WEA, which was supported in part by Carnegie funds, has already been noted. Hall, however, left for Syracuse University in 1926 and then worked as a senior official at the League of Nations, never returning to Australia to live, though he was a frequent visitor and his ideas had some influence on Australian scholars. He is best known for his monumental and ruminative *Commonwealth* (1971) for which he failed to secure Carnegie funding in 1950 (CCNY, Box 157, Folder 6). Neither, when he had moved to Washington in 1940, did he convince Carnegie that they should support a study of the psychology of international conflict which he planned to write with one of Freud's disciples, Robert Waelder. However, while working for the British War Supply mission in Washington, Hall did prepare for the Carnegie Institute of International Peace a report on the mandates system of the League that was circulated at San Francisco and was later expanded as *Mandates, Dependencies and Trusteeship* (1948) (CEIP, Box 82, Folder 2). The original report was praised by J.C. Smuts and had some impact on the debates on this issue. For the book, Hall was paid $750 and received $100 in clerical assistance; it is also apparent that Carnegie staff did much of the research and production work. A later work, produced by the AIIA and supported by the Endowment, was *Australia and the United Nations,* by Norman Harper and David Sissons (1959).

Fred Alexander was the major figure in international studies in Western Australia from his arrival in September 1924 through to the 1950s; his first book *From Paris to Locarno and After* (1928) is the best Australian contribution to the field in the pre-war era. His career illustrates the major impact of the foundations; it is also of interest given

Alexander's later personal role in the disbursement of both Carnegie and Rockefeller monies in Australia (Alexander, 1987).

Alexander's initial overseas studies and travels were funded by British capital. From 1940, Alexander enjoyed the bounty of the American foundations more than any other Australian figure in the field, though in view of his tireless activities it can be asserted that all those who facilitated his work were repaid several times over in lectures, articles, meetings, summer schools, and broadcasts. Having long been a partisan of the League and collective security, in the aftermath of the Abyssinia crisis Alexander formed the view that Australian security increasingly depended upon the United States. He thus sought to travel to America to study American opinion and engage with the local debate on the Pacific. An application to this end to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was not successful. In 1940, however, he managed to convince the Rockefeller Foundation to grant him a social sciences fellowship in 'international relations' to study 'Political Relations between the United States and Australia', which constituted a major watershed in his career ('Research project of F Alexander, 25 July 1939': IPR Butler Library, Box 35, '1940 Alexander, Frederick').

Arriving on the US west coast in January 1940, as a Rockefeller fellow Alexander was paid $200 per month for a full 12 months, an amount larger than his University of Western Australia salary ('Fred Alexander': RFA, RG10 Card Index, Social Science Fellowships). Starting with interviews in the major cities of California, he traveled extensively, making contact with academics and opinion leaders and sampling opinion wherever he went. Nor was his work merely of scholarly import. He took leave for seven weeks to assist at the new Australian Legation in Washington; the evidence suggests that the recently appointed Minister R.G. Casey made good use of Alexander's rich information on US opinion as well as of his many contacts ('Interim Report April 1940': IPR Columbia, Box 35). Having been provided with a letter of introduction by Eggleston (Eggleston to Carter 3 January 1940: IPR Columbia, Box 35, 'Eggleston 1940'), Alexander spent time on the East coast at the New York headquarters of the IPR, then visited Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and West Point, and also conducted many interviews in Washington. Over a weekend in late June, he participated in a meeting at Edward C. Carter's farm in Lee, Massachusetts, which, with the participation of senior IPR members, reviewed future American

policy in the Pacific (IPR Columbia, Box 35, '1940 Alexander, Frederick'). Australia was strongly represented, with Jack Shepherd and E. C. Dyason of the AIIA both in the United States at this time. In relation to the development of international studies, it is noteworthy that he then travelled to Chicago to participate in the seminar of Quincy Wright and attend the sixteenth 'Institute' of the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation in International Relations ('Notes by Fred Alexander', 6 July 1940: IPR Columbia, Box 35). He also played a leading part in a World Peace Foundation round table on Australian–American relations in Boston in October ('Introductory notes by Fred Alexander': IPR Columbia, Box 35).

The extant correspondence shows that Alexander was on very good terms with Carter at the IPR, and that his opinion was sought on many issues well beyond those specifically related to Australia (IPR Columbia, Box 45, '1941 Alexander, Fred'). Though his war service interrupted his long-term writing plans, the work he produced for the World Peace Foundation, *Australia and the United States* (1941), was an influential statement of the interests shared by the two nations in the period before the Pacific War. Upon his return, Alexander helped in the launch of the Australian–American Association, which mobilized elite opinion on the question of the future role of the United States in the Pacific.

In 1950, Carnegie's Dominions and Commonwealth Fund granted Alexander $5,000 to undertake a study tour of South Africa, to travel to Britain and then to return by way of North America. On the terms of the grant, Shepardson (Director of Carnegie's British Commonwealth and Dominions Fund, and a former OSS operative) remarked, 'this sum was equal to the largest amount voted to any individual for travel and study since the war' (Shepardson to Alexander, 25 February 1949: CCNY Columbia, Series 3A, Box 8, Folder 6). According to his report to the University on his 1950 activities, he notes that he offered 20 seminars, made 45 broadcasts, wrote many newspaper pieces, and conducted 25 university visits ('Report to UWA 15 February 1951': CCNY Columbia, Series 3A, Box 8, Folder 6). He is concerned to emphasize that there is now much enlarged scope for inter-dominion collaboration, especially post-graduate and staff exchanges. In thanking Carnegie, Alexander observes that 'association with the Corporation gives prestige wherever a Fellow works.'

As an indicator of the degree to which the big foundations cooperated, with Carnegie's approval he spent some time in New York consulting with Rockefeller and recommended changes, subsequently endorsed, to the social sciences fellowships scheme in the southern dominions. Since 1946, Alexander had been on the small committee that recommended candidates to Rockefeller for fellowships, and in 1953 replaced D.B. Copland as chair. A short history of the program prepared for internal purposes describes Alexander as for long 'the wheelhorse' of the Committee ('Soc Sc Fellowships Australia': RFA, 1.1 410 Projects, Box 5, Folder 60). Later, by agreement with Rockefeller, the same committee also did service for Carnegie, selecting candidates for their graduate fellowships at Duke University. After a visit to Australia from New York, Secretary-General Roger F. Evans formed such a favorable impression of Alexander's endeavors that the number of fellowships for Australia was increased. As is noted, Evans was impressed by 'the importance … of such working contact and leverage as the Foundation's activity assured in this highly strategic white area close to Asia' ('Brief History of the Administration of RF-SS Fellowships from Australia and New Zealand', 24 April 1959: RFA 1.1 410 Projects, Box 5, Folder 60).

After Moore and Eggleston, the most important figure in IR at the University of Melbourne in the succeeding generation was W. Macmahon Ball, first professor of political science. In addition to his academic distinction, Macmahon Ball also occupies a notable niche in Australian diplomacy, serving as Minister on the Allied Council for Japan during the Douglas MacArthur era. Macmahon Ball had not come to academia by an entirely conventional route; from a tenuous position at Melbourne University, his career was impelled forward at a decisive moment by the award of a Rockefeller Social Science Fellowship for the study of 'political science in England' at the London School of Economics beginning in 1930. Records show that his stipend of $250 per month was renewed for a second year ('W Macmahon Ball': RFA, RG10 Card Index, Social Science Fellowships). Though he took no degree, Macmahon Ball was clearly influenced by the teaching of Laski and by ideas of the British internationalists, as the book he completed upon his return, *Possible Peace* (1936), shows.

As was the case with Fred Alexander, Rockefeller support seems both to have identified Macmahon Ball as a suitable grantee, and facilitated that rise to prominence which allowed the full flowering of his talents.

It also facilitated later funding from Carnegie. Having arranged a European tour for 1938, Carnegie eventually found, after an initial rejection, $1,000 to allow Macmahon Ball to include five weeks in the United States in his return travels. This support appears to have been forthcoming as a result of the fact that the University of Melbourne was establishing an honors school in political science and Ball, who was to be its head, was anxious to have first-hand experience of the teaching of the subject in the United States. Keppel seems also to have formed a favorable assessment of him during his visit to Australia in 1937 (CCNY Series 3A, Box 53, Folder 18). Macmahon Ball was appointed to the new political science chair at Melbourne in 1949, and even after the appearance of IR as a departmentally based discipline at the Australian National University (ANU), remained the most influential figure in the field through the 1950s. As a prolific broadcaster in the era when radio was the chief medium of expert commentary, and as a liberal with leftist sympathies whose ideas sometimes provoked controversy, Macmahon Ball's work had an impact well beyond academia.

Prompted by similar developments in the United States, the organization of an SSRC (along American lines) in Australia attracted a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation of $8,000 per annum for a five-year period. Macmahon Ball was a member of the first research committee of the SSRC and undoubtedly as a result of his influence, IR was listed as the first of the six research priorities of the Council. The focus was to be upon trends in 'International Thinking in Australian Politics' especially regarding relations with other powers in the Pacific and in Southeast Asia and Australia's role as a ruler of dependent territories. In imitation of methods then fashionable in the United States, the methodological approach was to analyze 'decision making' on these questions (Memo of the Research Organisation 1953: CCNY Series 3A, Box 330, Folder 2). Successful applicants for SSRC support could expect to receive £600–700 for their projects. Macmahon Ball's connection with the foundations had served to enhance his influence amongst Australian scholars of IR.

In 1947, Carnegie initiated a new scheme for Commonwealth Fellowship. Amongst the members of the selection committee was W.K. Hancock; after a lunch with him in December 1952, Shepardson records the opinion that he is 'an absolutely first-rate fellow' (Note, 15 December 1952, Commonwealth Fellowships 1947–1960: CCNY Series 3A, Box 314, Folder 11). In 1955, Macmahon Ball received a grant

under this arrangement; his STG£1,657.15.10 took him to Rangoon and India, and then on to Chatham House and St Antony's College, where he was to work on a revision of his *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia* (1952).

In the late 1930s, the foundations took a particular interest in younger figures associated with the AIIA. William Gray, W D Forsyth, and Jack Shepherd all worked and studied abroad as a result of foundation and IPR patronage (on Gray, Dyason to Keppel 13 July 1936: CCNY Series 3A, Box 154, Fold 23; on Forsyth, 'W D Forsyth': RFA, RG10 Card Index, Social Science Fellowships, see also Forsyth 1974; on Shepherd, 'Personal Record', Jack Shepherd 1938: IPR Columbia, Box 20). Shepherd's *Australia's Interests and Policies in the Far East* (1940) is the best contemporary account of the development in Australia in the 1930s of the awareness of Asia.

Gordon Greenwood, Professor of History and Political Science at the University of Queensland, was the recipient of a Carnegie fund in 1955–56 for study on the contemporary Commonwealth (CCNY Series 3A, Box 593, Folder 8). His grant-in-aid of $5,500 took him to the UK, where he was based at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies in London, and subsequently to Europe. He then traveled to North America, where he spent time at Duke and Harvard and also visited Canada. At the time, he was preparing the first of the *Australia in World Affairs* series and was also AIIA Research Chair. His application was strongly supported. In his assessment of Greenwood, Nathaniel Peffer at Columbia wrote that he was 'greatly impressed by Greenwood' (CCNY Series 3A, Box 593, Folder 8).

By some measures, the most original intellect to tackle the analysis of global politics in the immediate post-war period was Arthur Lee Burns. Burns was a Melbourne graduate and had attended the LSE under British Council auspices; he was the first Australian to publish in *World Politics* (1957), and remains in that very small company of IR scholars who have appeared in the leading American journals. At that time, focusing upon the impact of nuclear weapons on state behavior, he was endeavoring to conceptualize the international system using techniques drawn from game theory and micro-economics. His work in Australia had attracted the attention of some leading American scholars, and Klaus Knorr, who referred to his 'exceptional powers as a scholar', invited him to the Princeton Center of International Studies (CCNY Series 3A, Box 446, Folder 7). Morton Kaplan at Chicago then appears

to have initiated an application to Carnegie, which resulted in the award, after the appropriate application, of $2,500 for a traveling scholarship (Kaplan to Pifer, 29 January 1958: CCNY Series 3A, Box 446, Folder 7). In his final report to Carnegie, Burns accounts for a trip which, following his Princeton sojourn, included almost all the centers and personalities of IR in the United States. In it, he indicates a growing awareness of the place of Australian IR on the global map ('Report on Travel and Study in the United States from February through June 1959': CCNY Series 3A, Box 446, Folder 7).

An episode which takes the story into the very early 1960s is Rockefeller's support for the work of John Burton at the ANU and its repercussions. As a Visiting Fellow in International Relations, Burton had secured a Rockefeller grant of $6,000 in May 1962 to produce a 'study of Asian/African nonalignment policies' (RFA 1.2 410 Projects, Box 14, Folder 166). One of his referees had been Macmahon Ball, who supported him strongly despite the fact that they had had their differences when Burton had been Secretary of External Affairs and Macmahon Ball had been an occasional diplomat. The Rockefeller files record an aspersion cast on Burton's character apparently made by Richard L. Walker (then at the University of South Carolina and a keen supporter of Chiang Kai-shek, later to be US Ambassador in Seoul), who suggested he was not capable of independent scholarship. Kenneth W. Thompson, Rockefeller Vice-President, ordered an investigation, and while a senior CIIA figure was most unimpressed with Burton's record (he may have spoken in support of the notion that the United States engaged in germ warfare in Korea, though 'there could not be any truth in subsequent allegations that Dr Burton, after a trip to China, became a convinced communist'), senior ANU academic P. H. Partridge described his recent book as impressive and original and was of the view that his non-alignment project would produce a work that 'will make quite a mark in the contemporary discussion of international problems' (Goodwin to Freund, 25 June 1962; Partridge to Crauford Goodwin, 28 June 1962: RFA 1.2 410 Projects, Box 14, Folder 166). An internal office memo records that Thompson decided to take no further action; Freund at Rockefeller then wrote to Walker indicating that they were satisfied with Burton's credentials and potential. Burton's grant had already been announced when Walker's opinion was expressed, and consequently its rescission would have been awkward. However, in the atmosphere of the

Cold War – it was probably fortuitous that the Cuban missile crisis was still a few months away – Rockefeller, especially with the IR realist Thompson in a position of great authority, might have taken that action. That they did not do so suggests that their stated desire not to impose any particular template on the production of research was more than merely a conventional sentiment.

4 Shaping the AIIA

In addition to travel and exposure, as has been noted, the IPR also framed and provided crucial funding for many of the earlier works in Australian international studies associated with the AIIA. From its foundation sources, the Institute-funded research programs in the Pacific countries devoted to agreed themes. By the standards of the era, the IPR provided an unrivaled munificence in its support of major scholarship. In the case of Australia, the sums were decidedly modest, though in the environment of the time undoubtedly encouraged work which would not have otherwise appeared. It should be recalled that participation in the IPR research program put Australia on the trans-Pacific map; the appearance of research studies guaranteed further invitations to IPR meetings. In 1928, the IPR gave a subvention of $600 for the production of *The Peopling of Australia* (by the Melbourne Institute group) and the same sum for *Studies in Australian Affairs* (by their Sydney counterparts). To place these sums in perspective, in this period, the IPR received $40,600 from the SSRC, and $110,000 from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, specifically for its research activities ('IPR: Biennial Report of the General Secretary', 23 October 1929, p. 6: IPR U Hawaii, Conference Series, Box B-2); in the long-range budget adopted in 1928, the Australian contribution to the IPR was set at £250 per annum. IPR subventions, which were generally offered on the condition that the labor and time of the writers could be regarded, for accounting purposes, as an equivalent sum, continued for all the books which appeared under AIIA auspices until the outbreak of the Pacific War.

The IPR also played a considerable role in making Australian work on Asia and the Pacific better known in the United States. The papers that had been presented by the Australian delegation at the 1942 IPR conference were published, under IPR management, by Princeton University Press (AIIA, 1944). The arrangements made for the

American edition of Macmahon Ball's *Japan, Enemy or Ally?* (1949) were extraordinarily favorable (IPR UBC, Box 7, Folders 2–7). The IPR located a publisher, had the sheets printed, produced the cover, and even paid Ball $750 in the form of a research grant (Holland to Ball, 26 July 1948: IPR UBC , Box 7, Folder 2). Although Macmahon Ball's writings on Japan had already generated extensive interest, latter-day Australian scholars might well envy the patronage of such an organization. If a transactional view is taken of this episode, and bearing in mind Macmahon Ball's chief contention in the book that Japan was now being embraced by Washington though little had been done to re-engineer the mentality that had made the Pacific War possible, the author could be seen as doing well while not serving prevailing American policy interests. Hegemony could not be seen to be reproduced in this incident.

Nevertheless, and setting aside particular incidents such as the support for Ball's Japan book, it must be conceded that the IPR through its research program set agendas and suggested approaches which the Institute's collaborators in Australia were generally pleased to adopt. The outline of the objectives and work of the IPR presented in the 1931 Handbook may be taken as a convenient example (IPR, 1931). The fundamental characteristic of the age is the contrast between the 'interdependence' which is the product of trans-national commerce and also communications, and the persistence of the principle of national sovereignty found in most political and even cultural institutions. Though not to be attributed solely to IPR influence, it is notable that this contrast is prominent in the writings of both Eggleston and Harrison Moore. The IPR program emphasizes the importance of practicing the 'scientific method' and especially of conducting 'research'. The Institute having been established, its work was focused on those issues of greatest concern in the Pacific but about which there was little 'scientific' knowledge: immigration and immigration restrictions, race and 'race-mixture', standards of living, tariffs, labor legislation, population, and food supply (IPR, 1931, p. 31). As has been noted, all of these topics were covered by the early work of the AIIA and as a result of IPR encouragement and funding.

However, the traffic in ideas was not all in one direction. A particularly Australian approach was taken by the various Australian contributors to the IPR-supported project on race and immigration. A mixture of

modes may be detected in the writing on these themes, ranging from factual accounts of the legal and other mechanisms used to restrict immigration, to arguments based on economics and geography which sought both to dispel notions that Australia could readily accommodate a much larger population and to advance the view that only 'white' immigrants could be assimilated (Cotton, 2009b). Whatever the impact of the IPR's trans-Pacific discourse, it did not weaken local ideas of racial exclusion. There are also cases of Australians arguing within the IPR for modifications to the agenda. Eggleston, for example, held decided views on the diplomatic machinery of the Asia Pacific region and submitted an outline of a project entitled 'New Syllabus for Diplomatic Relations' for consideration by the Pacific Council of the IPR during the Kyoto-Nara conference of 1929 (IPR U Hawaii, B-3, Folder 4). He also sought repeatedly to interest the IPR in what he considered was the neglected idea of naval disarmament in the Pacific.

The first successful approach to the foundations for assistance for the AIIA was made in 1936 by the protean figure of E. C. Dyason, businessman, man of affairs, and patron of the AIIA, who traveled to New York after attending the IPR meeting at Yosemite. Dyason had already persuaded the IPR (which in turn was drawing specifically on Carnegie funds) to host a visit by William Gray, secretary of his 'Austral-Asiatic Section' of the AIIA, to the Institute in New York, as part of a tour which would also take in London and then the 'Far East'. Dyason sought direct support from Carnegie, with the encouragement of Russell, to improve the library of the Section in Melbourne; he subsequently received $500 (Dyason to Carnegie, 12 September 1936: CCNY Series 3A, Box 52, Folder 5).

Dyason had greater success with Rockefeller. On the same day in 1936, he also wrote to the Foundation in similar terms, and subsequently met Joseph Willits of the Social Sciences Division of Rockefeller (Stapleton, 2003) to explain what the men at the Foundation found to be the most confused Australian situation. Willits favored granting $7,500 over three years, but only if Rockefeller's conditions were met, namely, that there should be a single national body to which funds could be directed and that the body in question should be incorporated. After some negotiation, Rockefeller's conditions were determining, and the Institute found a Commonwealth secretary and a research director (RFA, 1.1 410 Projects, Box 6, Folder 69). Due to wartime conditions,

the full $7,500 was not expended until 1944, when a further three years' funding was requested. It was granted in 1945 on the condition that the Institute find ways to sustain its activities from local sources (RFA, 1.1 410 Projects, Box 7, Folder 70).

Nevertheless, the foundations showed great confidence in the promise of the Institute which they hoped would become a southern equivalent of the CFRs. In 1947, Carnegie assumed the role of Institute patron, granting the AIIA (from the British Commonwealth and Dominions fund) $7,500 over three years (1948–50) (AIIA application to Carnegie, 17 October 1946: CCNY Series 3A, Box 52, Folder 5). The funds were paid on a diminishing scale, with the understanding, again, that by 1950 the organization would have used the money to generate self-supporting finances. In addition, as a result of a visit by Shepardson to Australia in 1947, a separate sum of $3,600 was paid to the Institute's full-time secretary, George Caiger, to undertake a study tour of other institutes (Shepardson to R. Boyer, 18 December 1947: CCNY Series 3A, Box 52, Folder 5).

By 1949, the Institute had grown to 931 full members and 51 corporate members, and the total income of the Commonwealth Council stood at A £2,107 (mostly the capitation fee from branches, and the final tranche of the Carnegie grant). However, attempts of the AIIA to mobilize funds from the corporate sector proved unsuccessful and the organization was unable to support a full-time national secretariat. Indicative of the close cooperation of the two organizations, in 1952 Shepardson conferred with Roger Evans at Rockefeller on the situation at the AIIA. Their joint efforts had been a 'disappointing experience' despite the presence in the organization of some 'first rate people'. Accordingly, Carnegie would not be finding any further funds for the new national headquarters that the Institute was planning (Internal memo, 20 May 1952, Shepardson Evans: CCNY Series 3A, Box 52, Folder 5). It was not until the 1960s that American philanthropy again came to have an impact on the AIIA, the Institute receiving $75,000 from Ford in 1963 to be devoted largely to research publications (Legge, 1999, pp. 131–133).

5 The foundations as vehicles for American hegemony: a comparative view

In the first half of the twentieth century, the Carnegie Corporation (founded 1911) and the Rockefeller Foundation (founded 1913),

established and endowed by the corporate giants of the age but managed, for the most part, by scholars and public figures, were the dominant dispensers of private funds, in the United States and worldwide, for educational, cultural, and scientific activities. Carnegie's own ideas included a strong internationalist element (Patterson, 1970) which was reflected in the activities of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The Carnegie Corporation focused in its earlier decades on education, including the provision of libraries and related cultural infrastructure. Support for the British Empire, later the Empire and the Dominions, reflected Carnegie's Scottish origins. The more personal style of Frederick P. Keppel, President of the Corporation, 1923–42, led to a widening of its activities, sometimes on the basis of friendship and social contact (Lagemann, 1989, pp. 7–9, 100–103). Edward C. Carter of the IPR was one of Keppel's intimates. Another intimate was James Russell of Columbia University, who travelled to Australia to assess the prospects for further work in those countries. White observes that Russell was the first Carnegie visitor, and he quotes Russell on the impact that exposure to external ideas would have on Australia's university educators: 'It occurs to me that if a few outstanding men in Australia were appointed Carnegie Visiting Professors of International Relations to America it would be a fine stunt' (Russell to Keppel, 8 May 1928: CCNY Series 1, Box 316; quoted in White, 1997, p. 6).

Rockefeller's internationalism was initially of a more applied kind; the betterment of the human estate was to be achieved by advances in medical science and public health. Rockefeller's turn towards supporting the social sciences is generally attributed to Beardsley Ruml, who, having worked briefly for Carnegie, transferred to Rockefeller, becoming president of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund in 1923 and later moving into the Division of Social Sciences. In 1922, he put forward proposals for a new and more systematic approach to the social sciences which was to prove transformative of the field in the United States (Bulmer and Bulmer, 1981, p. 371).

The Foundation's interest in the social sciences included IR, and as has been shown, some Australians began to derive some benefit from that interest from the late 1920s. This interest became more focused with the destabilizing impact on global security of the economic crisis which began in 1929, as is reflected in a 1934 position paper prepared in the

Rockefeller Foundation by John V. Van Sickle on future international research ('Notes on Possible Foundation Program in Fields of International Relations and Economic Security', 17 December 1934: RFA, RG3 Series 910, Box 7, Folder 60). It was Van Sickle's view that the Foundation should encourage the work of 'strong national groups', such as the RIIA and the CFRs; as for the IPR, it was 'working in another high explosive area where further support seems indicated' ('Notes', 3: RFA, RG3 Series 910, Box 7, Folder 60). Van Sickle's ideas, including an emphasis upon the award of Foundation fellowships, became embodied in Rockefeller policy (Kettridge to Walker, 7 February 1935:RFA, RG3 Series 910, Box 7, Folder 60). Such was the thinking that lay behind the fellowships awarded in Australia, as elsewhere.

On White's view of Carnegie's influence, the Corporation clearly sought 'to foster an emerging national interest in IR, Pacific affairs and American foreign policy'. He is skeptical, however, that these objectives rendered the recipients of grants and fellowships the 'unwitting dupes of American cultural imperialism' (White, 1997, pp.17, 20). Rietzler (2011) has argued that the foundations in Europe often advanced American national interests, even though they were sometimes vulnerable to manipulation by the governments of host states. This issue clearly requires a broad comparative approach if the Australian case is to be determined definitively.

The impact of the major foundations is the subject of considerable scholarship (e.g. Lagemann, 1999; MacLeod and Gemelli, 2003); in the health sciences, for example, the Rockefeller contribution supported major advances in knowledge (Fisher, 1978). In accounting for the powerful but diffuse influence of the major philanthropic foundations in the social sciences, the approach in the scholarship has often been to apply the cultural theory of Gramsci, whether in a strong (Fisher, 1983) or circumscribed version. Even Karl and Katz, though arguing for the 'limits' of Gramscian analysis, also concede that 'both the Rockefeller and the Carnegie Foundations appear to fulfil certain aspects of the Gramscian program' (Karl and Katz, 1987, p. 31). In this view, the activities of the foundations, whatever their precise content, have been devoted to the production and reproduction of cultural hegemony. Despite the fact that in this field, where it has provided the impulse to some insightful studies (see, for example, the interesting attempt to characterize the Carnegie Endowment world-view in Parmar, 2000,

pp. 39–40), the Gramscian position has become itself almost hegemonic and has thereby proved a mixed blessing for historical analysis. The difficulties of the Gramscian position are well known. Historical accounts which apply the theory un-mediated have difficulty in explaining why this specific project or scholar rather than another attracted the attention of a foundation, even if one or both was (apparently) bound to reproduce the hegemony of bourgeois culture. Similarly, as it is far from clear what ideas would constitute an 'anti-hegemonic' discourse, there is a strong tendency to characterize almost as an analytic truth whatever discourse is found through historical enquiry as serving the purposes of hegemony. This tangle is exemplified in scholarship on Gunnar Myrdal's *American Dilemma* (1944), famously funded by Carnegie and for which Keppel wrote an introduction (Southern, 1987). The result has been that even from a perspective sympathetic to that of Gramsci, such variations have been attributed to other factors, including bureaucratic politics, political pressure, or the force of external events.

The complexities entailed in operationalizing a Gramscian approach to the connection between foundation support and international studies are apparent in the work of Inderjeet Parmar. In a series of articles and papers, Parmar (1999, 2000, 2002a,b, 2007) gives an account, based on an impressive range of archival sources, of the strategy and role of the foundations in the rise of a globalist view in the United States in the years 1939–45. Functioning as 'mediators' between the state and the 'knowledge producers', Carnegie and Rockefeller funds were employed to undermine isolationist sentiment, to influence policy discourse and to mould public opinion to accept a global mission for the United States, and also to encourage the 'realist' mode of analysis in academic IR that was suited to buttress and legitimize such a mission. This project may be traced, on his view, to the preferences and aspirations of East-coast elites, including foundation trustees.

Parmar's narrative is highly persuasive, but it does entail methodological contortions. For his starting point is the fact that the most powerful voice in the United States at the outset was isolationist. On a Gramscian view, this voice would be expected to reflect the interest-based and elite-articulated hegemony of the time. Far from supporting that hegemony, the foundations through their commitment to a form of internationalism were actively subverting it; Parmar even goes so far as to describe their strategy thus: 'they constructed globalist counter-

hegemonic networks within an isolationist hegemony' (2007, p. 8). This is not to dispute that foundation funding has not had major, reflexive, and probably also not entirely anticipated consequences, not least for international studies and for the international system it seeks to analyze. An often cited example is the reorganization of Sociology at Harvard with Carnegie support (Lagemann, 1989, pp. 166–171) the work of which, it has been argued, provided the foundations for the avowedly anti-Marxist discourses of modernization and political development which provided the theoretical underpinnings for American intervention in the Third World (Gilman, 2003, pp. 76–92). Later, very substantial subventions for area studies from the Ford Foundation contributed to the elaboration of this position (Berman, 1983) which became a staple of political science curricula in the 1960s, including in Australia.

An alternative approach, dealing with much the same era as that analyzed by Parmar, is developed by Nicolas Guilhot (2007, 2008, 2011; see also Heilbron *et al.*, 2008). The focus of this work is upon Rockefeller support for the emergence of 'realism' in the United States. Guilhot's detailed account shows how the preferences of the Foundation and its advisers were a powerful, perhaps determining, influence. An important role was played by Kenneth Thompson, a student of Hans J. Morgenthau and an officer in the Division for the Social Sciences. Until this time, the foundations had shown a preference for studies of international law and cooperation; Guilhot goes so far as to describe the legalist approach as 'the ideology of philanthropy' (Guilhot, 2007, p. 7). In a review of the almost $10 million spent on international studies in the period 1926–45, Willits apparently was doubtful of the real benefit the effort had generated. With the environment of the Cold War in formation, the evident need to counter totalitarianism required a 'prudential realism' rather than a reliance upon international organizations. However, amongst scholars, a more important rival to realism was not the legalist approach (or 'idealism') but rather the then-fashionable attempt to assimilate IR to the 'behavioral sciences'. Guilhot demonstrates that Rockefeller chose to support scholars, individuals, and members of academic and policy institutions who rejected a social scientific approach; the Foundation was 'not a neutral player' in the then-contending approaches in the discipline (2007, p. 20) and its machinations 'contributed to cementing an influential intellectual minority and to propel it into institutional positions' (2007, p. 28). At Carnegie,

however, realism never exerted such an attraction, and international conciliation remained (and still remains) a priority. And it should be recalled that it was Carnegie who made possible the extension of the visit by Arthur Lee Burns to the United States. By contrast, when the Ford Foundation entered the field, it patronized behavioral scholars, with important further consequences for subsequent scholarly debates. In short, rather than exhibiting a hegemonic view, there existed important differences between the organs of big philanthropy. Further, the contrasting views in evidence are not readily reducible to differences of interest on the part of the dispensers of largesse. The Australian case would seem to fit this limited but still strategic account of influence.

6 Conclusions

According to Carnegie records, grants to 'the Southern Dominions' from 1935 to 1954 totaled $901,136. For the period of this study, the full amount would be around $1 million. The proportion spent on 'international studies', even if liberally defined, was no more than one-tenth that amount and thus estimating the influence of Carnegie should take into account the fact that the bulk of the money was expended on libraries and museums ('Grants made by the Carnegie Corporation for the Southern Dominions 1935–54': CCNY Series 1D, Box 5, Folder 8). In the case of Rockefeller, a review was undertaken in 1959 of support for the social sciences in Australia. Aside from the fellowships already discussed, $208,855 had been expended; by far the largest amount was directed to the Australian National Research Council for anthropological research. Again, international studies was only a moderately supported field, and exclusively through the AIIA (Australia and New Zealand Advisory Committee, 24 April 1959: RFA 1.1 410 Projects, Box 5, Folder 60). Similarly, IPR support, through strategic, was modest in monetary terms. In short, estimating the influence of the foundations and the IPR in international studies should begin with the acknowledgement that whatever they or the interests they represented received in exchange, their outlay was limited.

Between the three organizations, Carnegie, Rockefeller, and the IPR, it can surely be concluded that a number of Australian scholars in international studies gained international exposure and experience that they would not otherwise have had. In turn, their personal role in Australia

was enhanced and, in some cases, their approaches to academic work and public commentary became influential models. To assert this much is not, however, to suggest that these organizations imposed anything approaching a single and dominant intellectual or political hegemony. To consider the inter-war period first, there is no doubt that these organizations, and especially the IPR, functioned in part to open Australian eyes to the world beyond the empire. It should be recalled, nevertheless, that many of the recipients of foundation funds made their way to the UK rather than the United States. If it is possible to characterize the outlook of these organizations, it could be described as both scientific and also internationalist, albeit circumscribed by conceptions – sometimes implicit, sometimes articulated – of race and culture (especially in relation to Australian policy in the Pacific islands). And these ideas, accordingly, made some progress in Australia. But if the accounts of Parmar and Guilhot are to be followed, these notions came up against, in the 1930s, a strong stream of isolationism which was only overcome through war. If these organizations were spreading a hegemony of ideas, then those ideas were not necessarily the dominant ideas amongst the American ruling elite. Alexander's trip to the United States in 1940 no doubt played a small role in challenging the isolationist view; his later work in Australia can be seen as helping prepare his countrymen for the new American role in the Pacific. The organization that absorbed more funding than any other was the AIIA, closely affiliated with the British RIIA. The foundations and the IPR did, for a time, make some progress in building that single national body, focused upon the scientific analysis of contemporary global issues, which was undoubtedly their preferred vehicle. The national form of the Institute had its limits, and after foundation funding was withdrawn it reverted to the loose federal structure with which it began. Perennial Sydney–Melbourne rivalry proved stronger than American hegemony.

In the post-war period, there was some divergence of view between these organizations. In this era also 'international relations' began to take on a more organized and disciplinary character. Carnegie encouraged American internationalism while retaining a strong interest in projects of international conciliation; the foundation also diversified its support for the new social sciences. By contrast, if Guilhot's account is to be accepted, Rockefeller's preference for a 'realist' approach became institutionalized. The IPR remained liberal and internationalist until it

was overwhelmed by the tides of McCarthyism, its foundation sponsors meanwhile severing their linkages with the doomed organization. In short, there seems to have been a degree of diversity in American views.

What kind of Australian scholarship was encouraged? Neither Alexander's work on tensions in South Africa, nor Macmahon Ball's work on post-colonial nationalism in the Asia-Pacific, nor John Burton's study of Asian and African non-alignment can easily be appropriated to any single template. The earlier work of Burns certainly enjoyed a strong American reception, but his later thinking cannot be readily characterized as consistent with the dominant United States' school. To be sure, in the 1960s (and thus in an era beyond the scope of this paper), a strong school of realism founds its home at the ANU and in time spread its influence well beyond. However, this realism was brought not from the United States but from Great Britain (in the persons of J. D. B. Miller, Hedley Bull, and Coral Bell) and neither was its transport provided by the foundations. Some of its practitioners did benefit, however, from the beneficence of American philanthropy, the Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU, receiving $200,000 from the Ford Foundation in 1964. The Gramscian conception of hegemony is too inelastic to be applicable to the diverse impacts of American foundations on Australian international studies.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC, as well as the University of New South Wales for research support, and staff at the Carnegie Collections, Butler Library, Columbia, and at the Rockefeller Archive, Sleepy Hollow, New York, for gracious assistance.

References

AIIA (1944) *Australia and the Pacific*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Akami, T. (2001) 'Frederic Eggleston and oriental power, 1925–1929', in Paul Johns and V. Mackie (eds), *Relationships: Australia and Japan, 1850s–1950s*. Melbourne: Melbourne University, History Monograph 28.

Akami, T. (2002) *Internationalizing the Pacific. The United States, Japan and the Institute of Pacific Relations in War and Peace, 1919–45*. London: Routledge.

Alexander, F. (1928) *From Paris to Locarno and After. The League of Nations and the Search for Security 1919-1928*. London: Dent.

Alexander, F. (1941) *Australia and The United States*. America Looks Ahead Pamphlet Series No 1. Boston: World Peace Foundation.

Alexander, F. (1987) *On Campus and Off. Reminiscences and Reflections of the First Professor of Modern History in the University of Western Australia, 1916–1986*. Perth: University of Western Australia Press.

Ashworth, L.M. (2006) 'Where are the idealists in interwar international relations?', *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 291–308.

Ball, W.M. (1936) *Possible Peace*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Ball, W.M. (1949) *Japan Enemy or Ally?* New York: John Day.

Ball, W.M. (1952) *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Berman, E.H. (1983) *The Ideology of Philanthropy. The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bulmer, M. and Bulmer, J. (1981) 'Philanthropy and Social Science in the 1920s: Beardsley Ruml and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 1922–29', *Minerva*, 19 (Autumn), 347–407.

Burns, A.L. (1957) 'From balance to deterrence: a theoretical analysis', *World Politics*, 9(4), 494–529.

Carnegie Corporation of New York records, Butler Library, Columbia University [CCNY].

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace records, Butler Library, Columbia University [CEIP].

Charteris, A.H. (1940) *Chapters on International Law*. Sydney: Law School of the University of Sydney.

Condliffe, J.B. (1929) 'Problems of the Pacific 1929', Proceedings of the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cotton, J. (2008) 'Celebrating 75 years: the Australian Institute of International Affairs and Australian international relations', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 62(4), 523–539.

Cotton, J. (2009a) 'Imperialism and internationalism in early Australian international relations: the contribution of W. Harrison Moore', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 44(4), 639–657.

Cotton, J. (2009b) 'Realism, rationalism, race: on the early international relations discipline in Australia', *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(3), 627–647.

Dinning, H. and Holmes, J.G. (eds) (1935) *Australian Foreign Policy 1934*. Melbourne: Melbourne/Oxford University Press.

Fisher, D. (1978) 'Rockefeller philanthropy and the British Empire: the creation of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine', *History of Education*, 7(2), 129–143.

Fisher, D. (1983) 'The role of philanthropic foundations in the reproduction and production of hegemony: Rockefeller Foundations and the social sciences', *Sociology*, 17(2), 206–233.

Forsyth, W.D. (1974) 'The pre-war Melbourne group of the AIIA: some personal recollections', *Australian Outlook*, 28(1), 44–49.

Gilman, N. (2003) *Mandarins of the Future. Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Guilhot, N. (2007) 'The realist counter-enlightenment: the Rockefeller Foundation and the search for a theory of international relations in the social science era, 1945–1954', International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Chicago. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p180488_index.html.

Guilhot, N. (2008) 'The realist gambit: postwar American political science and the birth of IR theory', *International Political Sociology*, 2, 281–304.

Guilhot, N. (ed.) (2011) *The Invention of International Relations Theory. Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Hall, H.D. (1920) *The British Commonwealth of Nations.* London: Methuen.

Hall, H.D. (1971) *Commonwealth*. London: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Hancock, W.K. (1954) *Country and Calling*. London: Faber.

Harper, N. and Sissons, D. (1959) *Australia and the United Nations.* New York: Manhattan Publishing.

Harrison Moore Papers, University of Melbourne Archives 63/1 [HM].

Heilbron, J., Guilhot, N. and Jeanpierre, L. (2008) 'Toward a Transnational History of the Social Sciences', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 44(2), 146–160.

Holland, W.L. (1995) *Remembering the Institute of Pacific Relations: The Memoirs of William L. Holland*, edited and introduced by P.F. Hooper (ed.). Tokyo: Ryukei Shyosha.

Hooper, P. (ed.). (1994) Rediscovering the IPR. *Proceedings of the First International Research Conference on the Institute of Pacific Relations.* Center for Arts and Humanities, *Occasion Paper No. 2*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Hudson, W.J. (1980) *Australia and the League of Nations.* Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Institute of Pacific Relations, Butler Library, Columbia University [IPR Columbia].

Institute of Pacific Relations, University of British Columbia Library [IPR UBC].

Institute of Pacific Relations University of Hawaii [IPR U Hawaii].

IPR (1931) *Handbook of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow Conference 1931*. Honolulu: Institute of Pacific Relations.

Karl, B.D. and Katz, S.N. (1987) 'Foundations and ruling class elites', *Daedalus*, 116(1), 1–40.

Kobayashi, A. (2009) 'William Macmahon Ball: the public life of a political scientist', Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Melbourne: School of Historical Studies, University of Melbourne.

Lagemann, E.C. (1989) *The Politics of Knowledge. The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Lagemann, E.C. (ed.). (1999) *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Legge, J.D. (1999) *Australian Outlook. A History of the Australian Institute of International*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin/AIIA.

Long, D. and Schmidt, B.C. (eds) (2005) *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*. Albany: State University of New York.

MacLeod, R. and Gemelli, G. (eds) (2003) *American Foundations in Europe: Scientific Policies, Cultural Diplomacy and Trans-Atlantic Relations, 1920–1980*. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Meaney, N. (1996) Fears and phobias: E L Piesse and the problem of Japan 1909–39. *Occasional Paper No. 1*. Canberra: National Library of Australia.

Meaney, N. (2005) 'Frederic Eggleston on international relations and Australia's role in the world', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 51(3), 359–371.

Moore, W.H. (1932) 'The Institute of Pacific Relations', *The Australian Quarterly*, 13(March), 32–41.

Myrdal, G. (1944) *An American Dilemma. The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper.

National Library of Australia [NLA], MS5547, Papers of H Duncan Hall.

Osmond, W.G. (1985) *Frederic Eggleston. An Intellectual in Australian Politics*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Parmar, I. (1999) 'The Carnegie Corporation and the mobilisation of opinion in the United States' rise to globalism, 1939–1945', *Minerva*, 37, 355–378.

Parmar, I. (2000) 'Engineering consent: the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the mobilization of American public opinion, 1939–1945', *Review of International Studies*, 26(1), 35–48.

Parmar, I. (2002a) 'Anglo-American elites in the interwar years: idealism and power in the intellectual roots of Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations', *International Relations*, 16(1), 53–75.

Parmar, I. (2002b) 'To relate knowledge and action: the impact of the Rockefeller Foundation on foreign policy thinking during America's rise to globalism 1939–1945', *Minerva*, 40, 235–263.

Parmar, I. (2007) 'The roles of Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropy in the development of the realist tradition in American international relations and in the United States' rise to globalism', paper prepared for presentation at the International Studies Association Convention, Chicago 2007.

Patterson, D.S. (1970) 'Andrew Carnegie's quest for world peace', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 114(5), 371–383.

Riemans, M. (2010) 'International academic cooperation on international relations in the interwar period: the International Studies Conference', *Review of International Studies*, 37(2), 911–928.

Rietzler, K. (2011) 'Before the cultural cold wars: American philanthropy and cultural diplomacy in the inter-war years', *Historical Research*, 84(223), 148–164.

Rockefeller Foundation Archive, Sleepy Hollow, New York [RFA].

Shepherd, J. (1940) *Australia's Interests and Policies in the Far East*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations.

Southern, D.W. (1987) *Gunnar Myrdal and Black-White Relations. The Use and Abuse of an American Dilemma 1944–1969*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press.

Stapleton, D.H. (2003) 'Joseph Willits and the Rockefeller's European Programme in the Social Sciences', *Minerva*, 42, 101–114.

University of Adelaide (1932) *Calendar of the University of Adelaide 1932*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide.

University of Western Australia, Fred Alexander Papers, University Archives.

White, M. (1997) 'Carnegie philanthropy in Australia in the nineteen thirties – a reassessment', *History of Education Review*, 26(1), 1–24.

Woods, L.T. (1999) 'Rockefeller philanthropy and the Institute of Pacific Relations: a reappraisal of long-term mutual dependency', *Voluntas*, 10(2), 151–166.