

ccas  
newsletter  
committee of  
concerned  
asian scholars

may 1968  
number -1-

# BULLETIN OF CONCERNED ASIAN SCHOLARS

Back issues of BCAS publications published on this site are intended for non-commercial use only. Photographs and other graphics that appear in articles are expressly not to be reproduced other than for personal use. All rights reserved.

## ***CONTENTS***

### **Vol. 1, No. 1: May 1968**

- Leigh Kagan - A Statement of Directions
- Jim Peck - Reflections on the Implications of the Vietnam Caucus
- Summary of Philadelphia Vietnam Caucus Poll and Resolution Vote
- Leigh Kagan - Proposals
- Tom Engelhardt - Letter to the Committee on Fellowships
- Jon Livingston - Prospects for Graduate-Level Asian Studies in Canada
- Canada Questionnaire
- Mark Selden - A Call for Professional Soul-Searching
- National News Briefs
- The Editors - A Note on Messy Details

## CCAS Statement of Purpose

*Critical Asian Studies continues to be inspired by the statement of purpose formulated in 1969 by its parent organization, the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars (CCAS). CCAS ceased to exist as an organization in 1979, but the BCAS board decided in 1993 that the CCAS Statement of Purpose should be published in our journal at least once a year.*

We first came together in opposition to the brutal aggression of the United States in Vietnam and to the complicity or silence of our profession with regard to that policy. Those in the field of Asian studies bear responsibility for the consequences of their research and the political posture of their profession. We are concerned about the present unwillingness of specialists to speak out against the implications of an Asian policy committed to ensuring American domination of much of Asia. We reject the legitimacy of this aim, and attempt to change this policy. We recognize that the present structure of the profession has often perverted scholarship and alienated many people in the field.

The Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars seeks to develop a humane and knowledgeable understanding of Asian societies and their efforts to maintain cultural integrity and to confront such problems as poverty, oppression, and imperialism. We realize that to be students of other peoples, we must first understand our relations to them.

CCAS wishes to create alternatives to the prevailing trends in scholarship on Asia, which too often spring from a parochial cultural perspective and serve selfish interests and expansionism. Our organization is designed to function as a catalyst, a communications network for both Asian and Western scholars, a provider of central resources for local chapters, and a community for the development of anti-imperialist research.

*Passed, 28–30 March 1969  
Boston, Massachusetts*

ccas  
newsletter  

---

committee of  
concerned  
asian scholars

may 1968  
number -1-

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

C.C.A.S.

NEWSLETTER

NO. 1

MAY 1968

CONTENTS:

A Statement of Directions - Leigh Kagan	1
Reflections on the Implications of the Vietnam Caucus - Jim Peck	2
Summary of Philadelphia Vietnam Caucus Poll and Resolution Vote	5
Proposals - Leigh Kagan	7
Letter to the Committee on Fellowships - Tom Engelhardt	8
Prospects for Graduate-Level Asian Studies in Canada - Jon Livingston	10
Canada Questionnaire	13
A Call for Professional Soul-Searching - Mark Selden	14
National News Briefs	16
A Note on Messy Details - The Editors	18

THE EDITORS:

Leigh Kagan  
Jon Livingston

ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

CCAS, c/o Kagan  
96 Ellery Street  
Cambridge, Mass.  
02138

## A STATEMENT OF DIRECTIONS

At a time when students perceive that virtually all institutions in America are failing them -- by commitments to political and social philosophies manifestly irrelevant to current problems of American society, and thus to students themselves -- it is hardly surprising that they level this charge directly against the educational institutions in which they find themselves. We hear the outcries of disillusioned and frustrated undergraduates, and now by the simple step of matriculation into graduate schools and the happy accident of electing Asian Studies, students are bringing to this profession, its teachers and its students, their fundamental and totalistic concerns. The field of Asian Studies, neither as a scapegoat nor as a priesthood, but as part and parcel of American society and politics and of our individual lives, is due for a self-conscious, probing, and uncompromising re-examination.

Two major and interrelated approaches to this re-examination emerge: scholarly and political. The scholarly facet embraces, in its fullest, sense, the concept of education. It asks questions such as: to what extent professors should be concerned with issues politically and personally relevant to their students; should graduate school be only a professional training period or ought it not also be an intellectual community in which new areas and perspectives in scholarship are pursued; what is the actual relation of our educational institutions to the government, and is this relationship compatible with the ideals and goals of education.

Politically, we submit that Asian scholars are, in fact, involved in politics, that we acknowledge this, and that we address ourselves to the issue of how we are going to be political. This entails a willingness to transform the erudite results of our seminars and high-level conferences into statements intelligible to the American public; it involves the necessary simplification of scholarly arguments into more straightforward positions on admittedly complex issues, and the introduction of relevant human perspectives into overly abstract and "scientific" analysis.

Though generated in its initial stages by students and young faculty, the call for a re-assessment of the rationale of our profession, our scholarship, and our political role can be pursued only by bringing these matters to the conscious level of every member of the profession. This newsletter will serve as a forum for the discussion and communication of these and other related issues.

Leigh Kagan

## REFLECTIONS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE VIETNAM CAUCUS

It is revealing that a Vietnam Caucus held in March 1968 should end its meeting by beginning an evaluation of the professional "conscience" of Asian scholars. That it took this war to raise the latent problems in the profession is itself a depressing commentary on the state of the field. But the desire on the part of some individuals to create a nationwide inter-university student-faculty Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars to pose and then seek to resolve these problems fulfills one of the organizers' hopes.

If the efforts at Philadelphia to provide a forum for Asian scholars to speak out en masse on the war was the immediate preoccupation, the possible long range results are more important. For as attention became focused on the multiple facets of the relationship between "Asian expertise" and the war, there was evident uneasiness about the financial structures that support and influence the profession, concern over the channeling of research to fill government needs, and uncertainty over the relevance of expertise and of the scholar-intellectual to public affairs. If the caucus obtained an all but unanimous condemnation of American policy in Vietnam, it did not reach wide agreement over the nature of the profession's ills. Perhaps, however, this very lack of clarity indicates the number of issues needing investigation and the paucity of thought expended on them by those who have dominated the field up to now.

What struck me particularly, not least because of its present lack of conceptualization, was a growing frustration among graduate students over current educational practices and methods. It was not just a concern over government financing or the channeling of talent. These, of course, were mentioned often, but they tended to be only the surface manifestations of an immensely complex problem. If only a vocal minority should feel that Asian studies in universities is something to be endured, not enjoyed; if only a few were moved to an exasperated outcry against the much lauded "objectivity" in historical method that, they felt, carried with it a host of unexamined assumptions; if only a minority pleaded for a fundamental re-evaluation of the role of a scholar in Asian studies as a citizen: this nonetheless should give pause to the majority. For it indicates an effort to grapple with problems that many still claim do not exist.

True, there was a widespread and vague agreement that the university should not be just an employment agency, an adjunct of corporations, or an instrument of the government. If senior faculty members, nonetheless, were criticized with an excess of imagination and of moral passion by their younger colleagues and students, this seemed a pleasant change from the absence of either in their elders. In fact, wasn't there a reason for passion and outrage? Why, only now, should financing reveal itself as such a problem? Why, too, did those administrators and leaders in the field, those most informed about the mechanics of financing, of cooperation with CIA projects and government grants, need to be pushed at all? What,

in short, had been happening over all these years? Why had leaders in the field not raised questions all along about the political posture of their profession? Perhaps, as some of the juniors frequently suggested, because they simply didn't recognize them as problems.

Those in positions of authority are viewed by students as avoiding moral and political issues by taking refuge in questions of conduct, manners, and expertise. There were 'honest differences of opinion' or "you have a point, but I strongly disapprove of the manner in which you say it and your actions to correct it." Time and again, 'youth' was reminded of its lack of that training and experience which had made their elders such models of moderation and reason, such paragons of political effectiveness and neutrality. It was precisely on the issue of political neutrality that disagreements were strongest. "No," came the reply, "your neutrality is already a political and moral stance, already a posture that seems to me to acquiesce to a policy and a situation. Even your teaching methods, your demand for monographic studies that ignore the role of presuppositions in analysis, help to make the field what it is today."

An example might make some of the different opinions clearer: the debate on the draft. While overwhelming support was given in the Vietnam caucus to individuals who refused cooperation with the Selective Service system, this strong support hides, rather than clarifies, the issue. What, after all, did support mean? When the subject was brought up in meeting, there was invariably a conspicuous silence. "Well, yes, there is the draft, but let's return to relevant issues, i.e. the setting up of another committee. The core of the question, however, remained: was one really "politically objective" in aiding the government and assuming an "objective" methodological stance, while offering only platitudes of "support" for individuals confronting the draft, as though the problem was in another world from East Asian studies?

The conflicting roles of the critic, the intellectual, and the expert as a citizen were called into question. It is ironic that students have turned to the leaders in the field and charged them for their silence. For, in an effort to retain their political "effectiveness," East Asian experts have daintily danced around the complex inter-relationships of morals and politics while U.S. senators in Washington subordinated political tact to moral, political, and often scholarly condemnation of America's Vietnam policy!

"But, really, what has the draft to do with all this?" That question reflects, as well as any can, the split in opinion at Philadelphia. "The expert can analyze, yes, but finally he can't intercede between the individual and his relationship to the state. That is not his task or problem." "Well," came the reply of the draft-age graduate student, "you and I live in different worlds. For me John Locke is already a few centuries out of date. I'd rather start with the assumption that when your analysis of the Vietnam war all but

defines an objectively existing situation that is immoral, your retreat into 'objectivity' is hard to swallow. I don't expect you to agree with my answer, but can't you at least see the validity of the question? Can't you see that your "objective" analysis all too often has meant a passive support of the policy? If the draftable individual cannot avoid responsibility for his conduct by placing responsibility on the government, how can you? Can't you see how interwoven moral and political questions really are, how moral assumptions are a part of any political analysis? You may think the draft question is not an important one. All right, that is perfectly plausible. But can't you see that the issues it raises are similar to the ones that exist in your relationship to society, your work, your life? And if you can't, how can a meaningful re-evaluation of the field take place? So the argument went.

Given the division of opinion, agreement over the nature and direction of the new inter-university organization was impossible. But even without such unity there remained a desire to re-evaluate the profession, its concepts of objectivity, its influence and the influences that act upon it. That this would be a thorough examination was doubtful to some. But at least we could leave Philadelphia with a few hopes to accompany the depression that brought us to that city in the first place.

Jim Peck

SPEECH OF VIETNAMICUS POLL, PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 23, 1968

I. Purpose of the War	Y es	%	N o	%
	Absol. Vote	Absol. Vote	Absol. Vote	Absol. Vote
A. The Administration's Vietnam policy is justifiable in terms of the following:				
1. Vietnam is a test case for "Wars of National Liberation"	67	20	271	80
2. The war helps contain Chinese influence	42	13	274	87
3. The war is an effort to safeguard South Vietnam's right to self-determination against aggression.	49	15	281	85
4. The war helps prevent the spread of communism into other areas of Asia (through "domino theory")	44	14	282	86
B. The Administration has presented an acceptable explanation that justifies its policy in Vietnam	26	9	303	91
C. We have already lost the war in terms of stated objectives	261	81	61	19
II. Escalation and de-escalation questions				
A. Would you support:				
1. An invasion of North Vietnam	7	2	332	98
2. "Hot pursuit" into Cambodia and Laos	31	12	206	88
3. An immediate U.S. withdrawal	166	50	167	50
4. Gradual and unilateral U.S. troop withdrawal under umbrella of negotiations	282	88	39	12
5. An "enclave" approach (or adaptation thereof) as a viable means of de-escalating the war	174	53	157	47
6. A rapid escalation of the war as a means to a quick victory	18	6	325	94
7. The use of tactical nuclear weapons	7	2	339	98
8. An end to our bombing of North Vietnam	298	89	40	11
III. Negotiations				
A. Has the Administration made realistic efforts to enter into negotiations?	51	16	274	84
B. Would a negotiated settlement that leads to a communist government in the south be so inimical to our national interests that we should continue the war?	23	7	318	93
C. Should we explicitly state our willingness to negotiate directly with the NLF?	122	86	19	14
IV. General Questions				
A. Does escalation of the war increase prospects of war with China?	318	94	20	6
B. Do you think that a de-escalation of the war will require a different administration?	275	85	48	15
C. Do you support those individuals who decide to refuse cooperation with the Selective Service system because they consider the war in Vietnam unjust and immoral?	272	83	57	17

## RESOLUTION BALLOT

	<u>%</u>	<u>Absolute votes</u>	<u>Total votes</u>
<b>I. Individual Vote- Express your opinion on each of the resolutions</b>			
Resolution Number 1			
Support	70	261	
Do not Support	15	51	
Abstain	15	51	363
Resolution Number 2			
Support	13	69	
Do Not Support	70	258	
Abstain	12	44	371
Resolution Number 3			
Support	61	216	
Do Not Support	26	96	
Abstain	13	48	360
Resolution Number 4			
Support	77	281	
Do Not Support	13	49	
Abstain	10	37	367
<b>II. Preferential Vote- Of the four resolutions, check the number of the <u>one</u> which most nearly expresses your opinion.</b>			
Resolution Number 1	19	65	
Resolution Number 2	14	50	
*Resolution Number 3	39	142	
Resolution Number 4	28	166	367

\* Resolution accepted as the "sense of the meeting"

Added note: Copies of the original texts of the resolutions may be obtained by writing to the newsletter.

## PROPOSALS

In "A Statement of Conscience for the Profession," drawn up by graduate students of the Committee of Asian Studies at Washington University (St. Louis) and presented to the Vietnam Caucus in Philadelphia, the complicity of Asian scholars, witting or unwitting, in US policy in Asia is asserted. Two features of the field seem to contribute to this stance: the financing of the profession and the nature of its methodology. To correct this compromising position a commitment to the need for revolutionary change in Asian lands is urged, and a concomitant re-orientation of the scholarship and teaching in the field.

To pursue these tasks, the following concrete suggestions have been made:

- 1) the influence of government financing: if, as has been alleged, the CIA has virtually created the field of South East Asian Studies, what are we going to do about it, how can we (from what financial source/s) create an intellectually independent field?
- 2) the relationship between research institutes and government agencies: why should they be privy to our skills and resources when we, more often than not, have no access to their information--frequently obtained through our participation?
- 3) analysis of foreign policy assumptions: what is nation-building? Why did Rostow's wrong thesis on economic development work in Taiwan?
- 4) new assumptions for foreign policy would imply research of new areas in new ways, and old areas in new ways. This would lead to such questions as: Are Tibet and Vietnam comparable instances of genocide?
- 5) position papers to counter existing ones, such as the "counter-Tuxedo" statement currently being prepared at Yale University.

So that studies and papers on these topics will be well-documented and demanding of our attention, it is necessary that they become objects of current study within the graduate schools and research institutes, that professors recommend and students request work in these areas--as course papers, seminar topics, research projects.

Whenever enough papers on any one of these or other interrelated topics have been produced we should then plan to publish them as a book.

Please forward to the Newsletter specific suggestions for implementing the concerns enunciated in the "Statement of Conscience"--in terms of papers proposed, other topics, other ways to pursue the concerns so that everyone in the profession can know what is being done, what can be done, what needs to be done.

Leigh Kagan

April 24, 1968

Dear Dean Phelps:

On the morning of April 3, at the Boston Common, I turned in my draft card. I felt this to be a reply to three different types of "channeling" which I saw as affecting my own life. First of all, it was a reply to General Hershey's statement that manpower channeling "is the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in foreign countries where choice is not permitted." I disassociated myself from the draft system which was flagrantly attempting to make me live a life without freedom.

But I and my friends had been "channeled" long before General Hershey ever got to us. We had been taught for years, implicitly and explicitly, that we had no choice but to live as we were living if we were to avoid an unthinkable variety of horrors: that we should not think for ourselves, sign any statements, speak as we believed, or appear conspicuous to others. My reply on April 3 then, was to choose what I felt to be a sane, moral, integral, and available alternative to the life I had been living.

Finally, I entered into resistance against an American government which was, with the help of the men provided by the draft, attempting the most serious type of "channeling" outside our own country. This is especially obvious in Vietnam where it denies the people of South Vietnam the opportunity to consider viable alternatives to their present government. Moreover, as that attempt at "channeling" (or, as it is called, "winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people") met opposition, the American government, through its armed forces, committed acts of such unbelievable horror as to be unbearable to a thinking person.

On the afternoon of April 3, on returning to my apartment, I found a letter from Harvard University offering me a National Defense Fellowship to study Chinese language and history, at Harvard, "in the"national interest" for a government which has for years been flagrantly working against that interest. The mistake in a sense had been mine. I had applied for the grant, thoughtlessly, and for that I apologize. Nonetheless, arriving as it did, at the moment it did, it seemed like a bribe (even if obviously an unconscious one). "You made your silly gesture it said, now forget it, and take this money." "There are no strings attached," said my friends and perhaps not.

My friends, in fact, offered me several rather cogent reasons for accepting the money. Some said, "Why not take it? The government's not monolithic. Why oppose all the government as if it were one, when you can actually accept this and go on with your activities against those parts of the government you don't like?" And I had to agree. No, the government's not monolithic. But all I can suggest is some of the doubts I nonetheless held: First, while there are explicit laws which prevent federal employees from speaking up on political matters, there are also, it seems to me, implicit emotional laws which often bind those federal employees called teachers who spend their time on government funds. Sometimes too easily we convince ourselves that there will be no strings attached to what we badly want or badly need. Yet it seems to me clear that the massive government funding of the Chinese field, impelled by the concept of China as a mortal enemy of the

United States, has had a strong effect on everything our field has produced. It is hard enough to keep a clear mind and an independent stand in such an atmosphere without the pressures of continued funding, of the training of C.I.A. agents in our departments, of the blandishments of the Defense Department which will buy our books if only they can be classified beyond our view for ten years, of the offers to show those chosen ones of us secret information from China which is, of course, to be used only selectively. Finally I suppose everyone must pick his own way of protesting what offends him and I simply would repeat that it can be a more difficult feat, emotionally, to protest against a government from which you have just received financial support.

Others of my friends have said, "Tom, don't be an utter fool, take the money and use it to subvert the purpose of the government in giving it to you." But I'm afraid I'm not temperamentally suited to this method. It is hard enough, in this country, to wrench oneself out of apathetic fear and the once-every-fourth-year satisfaction of casting a vote, without taking an immediate step back into that situation. Even were this path appealing to me, as is so often the case, it would surely fall by the wayside of "good sense" and a desire for continued "security", i.e. for renewal of the money.

And still others have said, "Don't give it up, Tom, take it, but carve out your own autonomous sphere and forget the government." A few perhaps can truly do this, but most of us fall a way sooner or later into feelings of obligation, into a sense of complicity, into weakness, and our "sphere" dissolves before us.

Others have even said, "But Tom, compared to other fields, the Asian field is not so bad at all. This is just the way things are all over and you might as well face facts. What you're really talking about is a transformation of the educational system." That I reply is no excuse for what goes on in our own field: and, as a matter of fact, a transformation of the educational system so that the government did not so blatantly seduce, undermine, and exploit scholars would not bother me in the least. But certainly I can not expect something of others if I am not willing to take a first, minor and somewhat hesitant step towards it myself.

Finally, what about the NDFL? It is, I have been told, innocuous, fairly administered, and helpful to the promotion of learning. I won't bother to dispute this. But like so many first steps, so many deals we enter where we are assured there are "no strings," we are later surprised to find ourselves trapped. I look at this first step and it seems so harmless, in fact so inviting; but I look at the results in the field of modern Chinese studies and I say "no," I will take my chances another way with few regrets.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas M. Engelhardt

## PROSPECTS FOR GRADUATE-LEVEL ASIAN STUDIES IN CANADA

Reactions to the Vietnam war and the draft on the part of American students have taken numerous forms--willing acquiescence, enlistment in the army, unhappy but silent disapproval, militant anti-war activities, and (more recently) induction refusal and Resistance. One option open to students that is rarely discussed is emigration to Canada to avoid conscription. The following is an investigative swing through Eastern Canada by two graduate students at Harvard who surveyed graduate programs in Asian studies at the major universities in the belief--sad but increasingly borne out--that such events as the Philadelphia Vietnam Caucus and electoral politics would have little influence over our fate at the hands of the Selective Service. Indeed, recent events seem to confirm many of our fears. Even if peace talks ever do break out, the war will probably drag on for some time, the draft will continue, and latest estimates by Gen. Hershey all for larger draft calls in fiscal 1969, not a reduction.

The situation has, therefore, changed little or not at all since Lyndon Johnson's dramatic, but less than convincing, statement of March 31. Our brief survey--including material received from British Columbia schools--should be valuable for any students who find themselves considering emigration to Canada.

A point of information: Canada is not a carbon-copy of the United States. As a modern industrial society it does share many characteristic features of American Civilization--gas stations, billboards, housing developments--but it is also subtly different in interesting ways. The military is not ubiquitous but insignificant; its minority problem is one of language rather than race, though equally critical; and Queen Elizabeth still reigns over the Dominion.

Best of all, there is a remarkable sense of freedom in Canada. The Vietnam war is merely a bad dream bothering someone else, and there is very little of the frantic sense of impending disaster so common (and grimly real) here. On the other side of the ledger, there is a parallel feeling of isolation; many expatriated Americans are troubled by homesickness, and students find money more difficult to come by. If one is capable of making the psychologically difficult step of breaking completely with the United States, he will find Canada a pleasant place quite unlike the "Rose Marie" image. Anyway, for many it is not a matter of choice.

Canada lags behind the United States in Asian Studies and is only beginning to expand and diversify its academic programs to catch up with American efforts. This is perhaps the most serious problem facing American Asian scholars in Canada, and students should be aware that Canadian schools are generally poorer in facilities, staff and financial resources. Only one school--British Columbia--has an adequate library, though others are attempting to build up their collections. Likewise, it is impossible to find the "regional studies" approach, British traditions still being predominant, so that the only route is through the disciplines, languages and literature, history, etc. Given these handicaps, however, Canadian schools still have a great deal to offer in Asian Studies, with the following three universities in the forefront.

The University of Toronto offers courses in the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese areas, including advanced language study in each. At present a Ph.D is available only in Indian languages and literature; Chinese and Japanese are limited to M.A. and M.Phil., but the faculty is substantial in both. Staff is also good in other fields, especially Japanese history, but still quite young. They are scattered and students must apply to the appropriate department. Toronto cannot handle a large number of new students, but the professors we talked to indicated their sympathy and promised to help. An additional spur is the practice in Ontario of granting all graduate students small fellowships. (These would not be available until next year.)

McGill is just beginning to set up a program, with only Chinese taught now. Japanese is planned for the near future, and Near Eastern languages are available in Montreal. McGill's strongest side is Modern China, particularly in economic, politics, and sociology. Graduate students entering McGill would, in effect, be getting in on the ground floor and would be involved in building up a growing program.

British Columbia is the most balanced of the Canadian universities in terms of faculty, program, and facilities. The Asian library is adequate for advanced graduate study, and languages are taught at all levels. The major problem, naturally, is money--the provincial legislature is a notorious skinflint. However, this is universal in Canada, and U.B.C. is generally the best bet, perhaps really the only choice for students with any advanced work already under their belts.

At least two schools provide a reasonable program for students at an elementary level of language training and interested in graduate work in the disciplines: Sir George Williams University in Montreal and Simon Fraser University in Vancouver. Both offer little in Asian studies, but have intriguing and vaguely leftish graduate programs, with possibilities for teaching. They are also close to schools with Asian programs, and may establish their own departments.

Obviously a decision to emigrate to Canada is not to be made lightly or naively. One should be aware of the legal and psychological results that such a decision will mean--for example, the likelihood that one can never return to the United States.

Canada will be glad to have you, but it would be childish to view emigration as a pleasant and temporary excursion. If one does make the decision, information should be obtained from one of the anti-draft groups in Canada about the technicalities of becoming a landed immigrant. And one should be extremely cautious in arranging the move; reliable reports from Canada tell of CIA and FBI agents harassing ex-Americans, and the author experienced Border Patrol surveillance in Northern Vermont. Even secrecy--melodramatic or not--is advised.

The idea of becoming an exile is hardly an attractive one. Given the present circumstances, however, it may be a very reasonable "alternative" indeed.

Jon Livingston

## CANADA QUESTIONNAIRE

For the benefit of graduate students considering emigration to Canada to continue graduate studies there and for those Canadian graduate schools which will be attempting to absorb the new wave of prospective students after June, a committee has been formed to determine the size of this group and how best to intergrate these students into comparable Canadian programs. Application for admission must be made to the individual university as soon as possible to be certain of a place. June or July is usually the deadline for most of these schools.

A copy of this questionnaire should be sent for each student in this category to:

Jon Livingston  
14 Sumner Road  
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_
- Address \_\_\_\_\_
2. Which Canadian universities are you seriously considering applying to?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Educational background:  
Undergraduate B.A. in \_\_\_\_\_. Special emphasis in Asian studies? \_\_\_\_\_. Date and college at which issued \_\_\_\_\_.  
Graduate degrees \_\_\_\_\_. Discipline \_\_\_\_\_. Date and university at which issued \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. Current status (graduate year) \_\_\_\_\_. School \_\_\_\_\_. Discipline \_\_\_\_\_.  
5. Language training: Language(s) \_\_\_\_\_. Years studied \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. Career goal: Teaching \_\_\_\_\_; college \_\_\_\_; high school \_\_\_\_\_.  
Other \_\_\_\_\_
7. Draft status now \_\_\_\_\_; after June \_\_\_\_\_. Age \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

## A CALL FOR PROFESSIONAL SOUL-SEARCHING

(Originally a letter to Prof. John Watt.)

I am writing to pursue the possibility of taking concrete steps to further the aims of the newly formed Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars. The CCAS emerged from the Vietnam Caucus at the recent meeting of the Association for Asian Studies on the basis of graduate student demands that the profession act more independently and effectively in bringing its expertise to bear in the realm of politics and public education. If CCAS was born of a feeling of crisis growing out of the Vietnam war, and if much of the activity which it has subsequently generated is directed toward the immediate problem of Vietnam, there were many who sensed the importance of longer range professional considerations for Asian scholars.

I feel that the following proposal would go a long way toward legitimizing and forwarding the concerns embodied in the formation of the Committee. I suggest that this summer we finance half a dozen graduate students (and perhaps one professor) to initiate full-time research into the U.S. fundamental issues concerning the Asian studies profession: its values, methodology, goals, financing, and its relationship, actual and ideal, to American foreign policy--that is, the concerns articulated in the student "Statement of Conscience for the Profession." I envision the participants in the project, drawn from centers throughout the country, working in the Cambridge area where they could provide a nucleus for the work of the CCAS and its newsletter and at the conclusion of the project return to their universities to stir further interest in the work of the organization. The results of their research might also be utilized in one or more panels at the next AAS meeting or our own meeting prior to it. The participants in the project might meet on a regular basis among themselves and perhaps, at their invitation, with faculty sharing common interests who are in the Cambridge area next summer. (I for one would hope to participate in the project in this fashion.)

These proposals grow out of suggestions made to me by Rhoads Murphey who envisioned graduate students or younger scholars devoting a year or two to such long range concerns. To be sure, a summer provides time to do little more than to initiate such a project, but it is hoped that the participants would continue their work subsequently on their own campuses, supported by their own centers.

How would such a project be financed and at what cost? I should think that the modest sum of four or five thousand dollars would cover all expenses for half a dozen graduate students during a three month period of research. The source of financing is a more complex and ticklish problem, in part because our

Asian centers are, if I may say so, little used to cooperating with each other. My hope would be that the major centers interested in such a project--hopefully, at the very least, Michigan, Berkeley, Chicago, Yale, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Columbia and Harvard--would contribute funds specifically for this project through the CCAS. A less satisfactory possibility might be for each center to finance one of its own graduate students to participate in the project.

Because time is so short if we are to act this summer I am taking the liberty of requesting that Professors Fairbank and Murphey, who have indicated strong interest in these questions, investigate possible avenues for organizing and financing this project--if they deem it significant.

Assuming that no "angel" or single benefactor appears to finance the entire project, I would tentatively suggest that those major centers interested in the project be prepared to contribute \$500-700 toward its realization, and smaller centers \$200 (I am today submitting a formal request for the latter sum to the Asian Studies Committee, Washington University). A committee with representatives of sponsoring institutions might then review research proposals and select the recipients of our summer grant. I will be prepared to serve as secretary and clearing house for such proposals until such time that a responsible committee can be constituted.

(Copies of this letter were sent to numerous individuals, and efforts are under way to implement this suggestion.)

Mark Selden  
Washington University  
St. Louis

NATIONAL NEWS BRIEFS

University of Arizona (from a letter to Prof. Watt)

After receiving your letter, a few of us on the faculty of the Oriental Studies Department organized a meeting of graduate students and scholars of Asian studies. Our meeting coincided with the travel plans of Prof. Fairbank, who gave a talk on China to approximately six hundred people at the University and then came to our smaller meeting.

We were surprised at the turnout for our local CCAS. We had twenty-three people attending, including five faculty members, two teaching assistants, and the rest graduate students. We seem to have a number of persons eager to do something, but we are not exactly certain what we should do.

Prof. Fairbank suggested educational programs on the community level, and we will be contacting such groups as the Kiwanis Club and the League of Women Voters, asking them if they would like to have a speaker talk to their group about the "China problem" or some such subject related to Asia. We may also meet in study groups to prepare policy statements, which we can then submit to your proposed newsletter.

Right now we should like to hear from you again concerning more specific ways in which we can be useful. Needless to say we welcome receiving any information you are disseminating. I might add that the material you sent me on March 29th came at a decisive moment: those of us who had attended the Vietnam Caucus in Philadelphia were trying to decide what to do next when your letter arrived. It gave us the push we needed to organize our first meeting.

Gail Bernstein

Cornell University

A student-faculty committee, including undergraduates, was formed at Cornell on April 14th 1968. The committee has already made substantial progress in fulfilling our aims of offering some specialized knowledge of Asian affairs to the campus body in particular and to the community at large.

Lectures were given by our President during the recent weeks at teach-ins at both Elmira College and Potsdam State College, arranged through a process of liaison which has been established with the Tompkins County Peace Association.

In the limited time available to us before the end of the semester, a series of training seminars are being offered by faculty members and graduate students specializing in Southeast Asia and China. Tentative topics include China-SEA relations, SEA Communism, and the NLF. Some seventy students have signed up for these special sessions, and it is hoped that they will in turn pass on their knowledge at talks to their local community groups during the summer vacation. Annotated bibliographies and other supplementary materials will be made available to concerned students, all of whom, it should be mentioned, have had some experience in Asian studies.

We are in the process of arranging, in conjunction with the Inter-Fraternity Council, a symposium on Vietnam given entirely by Vietnamese nationals studying at Harvard, Yale, Western Ontario and Cornell. The symposium will be held on May 12 and 13, the first evening being devoted to presenting the Vietnamese world view, and will include poetry-reading and music, while the second evening will feature a Vietnamese notion of current events in that country. Dr. George Kahin,

Director of Cornell's SE Asia Program, will act as moderator.

We would be pleased to offer research assistance to readers of this newsletter. Copies of the annotated bibliographies plus research materials may be obtained on request. During the coming summer we hope to continue the work of training sessions for summer school students, many of whom will be high school teachers. Interested Committee members on other campuses who may be in the Ithaca area are invited to contact Mrs. Christine Pelzer White, 413 Dryden Road, Ithaca, NY 14850.

Ohio State University (from a letter to Prof. Fairbank)

I have followed with interest the proceedings of the Vietnam Caucus at the Philadelphia meeting. There is a time - and this is it - for agitation, and the more forceful a statement the better. But members of the AAS are primarily educators, and in the long run it will be in that capacity that their influence is greatest. The crying need as I see it is to get Vietnam out of the free universities and to the regular curriculum. We have done that at O.S.U., and I wonder whether our experience might not be of interest to others.

The obvious dilemma is that there are so few Southeast Asia specialists. The rest of us are inclined to be modest about our competence in Vietnam. Two factors offset our presumed inadequacy. First, there is a very large degree of carryover from China or Japan to Vietnam; I have been surprised at how large it is. Second, lectures are only one part of a course, and there is no shortage of excellent readings from highly qualified experts. Vietnam courses need not be restricted to schools with Southeast Asia programs.

Another obstacle is time: few of us have the leisure to work up new courses. But if the load is spread, the labor is reduced greatly, and the quality of the product improved.

The O.S.U. departments have an open course number at an advanced level for "special group studies," and it is under this title that we received approval only in January. Even with so little advance notice, our enrolment is close to 300. (Our 'rice paddies' course usually draws 40-50.) I think Vietnam courses will sprout up all over if the proper encouragement is offered.

--a copy of the syllabus can be obtained by writing: Richard Minear, Dept. of History, 216 North Oval Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Yale University (from a letter to Prof. Watt)

Two weeks ago we held an organizational meeting to establish the Yale CCAS. In attendance were about twenty graduate students and one faculty member. We are hoping to increase the membership over the next month. We discussed several possibilities for action:

(1) monthly seminars on topics relating to contemporary Asia and US policy to be conducted by various faculty members and graduate students with expertise in such fields. These seminars will be open to members of the Yale CCAS and the New Haven community. The first of these seminars will be held in early May -- the speaker will be Sam Popkin of the Economics Dept. on the topic of "Vietnamese Villages."

(2) invitations to three or four speakers per year from other universities, government service, etc. to deliver open lectures concerning the same sort of topics.

(3) providing speakers to civic and religious organizations in the New Haven area on problems relating to American foreign policy towards the Far East. We have had a group at Yale called the East Asia Information Project which has performed this function over the past academic year. EAIP will now be merged with the Yale CCAS.

(4) formation of policy groups among graduate students and faculty here at Yale. It is anticipated that these will be informal groups of people in related fields who will consider questions directly related to their areas of specialization. Any resolutions that are developed in this manner will be sent on to you for distribution in the newsletter.

(5) contacting Connecticut congressmen and news media to inform them of our existence and our willingness to provide any information or advice at our disposal. The New Haven papers have already been notified about the CCAS and have given us generous coverage.

Robert B. Oxnam and John Whitmore

#### A NOTE ON MESSY DETAILS

This newsletter is the first concrete result of the Philadelphia Vietnam Caucus. It is intended to be a wide-open forum for debate and discussion of Asian affairs for which there is presently no effective means of expression. We expect it to be controversial; if it is not, we will be disappointed. This first issue indicates the type of issues which seem of immediate urgency. The number and length will vary according to what we receive as articles. All readers - both faculty members and students - are urged to submit articles on "relevant" issues or anything bugging them about the field.

Our address, until further notice, will be CCAS, c/o Kagan, 96 Ellery Street, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

We decided to charge, since our enterprise requires money like any business, the eminently reasonable sum of \$5.00 for a year's subscription. For your money you will receive a tentative six issues. We hope to print longer essays and critiques, and all "profits" will be plowed back into the newsletter.

If anyone can think up a more suitable name for either the Committee or the newsletter, please let us know. We will adopt any truly irresistible suggestions.

We will forward upon request copies of the St. Louis "Statement of Conscience for the Profession" and the Vietnam Caucus resolutions' complete text as long as they hold out.

The Editors

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK