

LONDON – LSE IDEAS-CITY UoL WORKSHOP

“US THINK TANKS AND FOUNDATIONS IN WORLD POLITICS”

FRIDAY 14 FEBRUARY 2020

This international workshop considers the historic and contemporary role of American think tanks and philanthropic foundations in world politics. It is the first of two such events. The second will be held at the Nehru Memorial Institute in New Delhi in April. The aim is to evaluate the significance of organised knowledge – in elite think tanks, foundations and allied institutions – in US foreign and national security strategies and approaches.

In the LSE IDEAS-City workshop the focus is on the role of US think tanks in several states and societies including India, China, Indonesia, Japan, Iraq, western Africa, and Brazil, and in building and consolidating the liberal international order.

It is also clear that the US think tank landscape is evolving especially in the wake of broad discontent with liberal interventionism that led to “forever wars”. The workshop will consider how think tanks are responding to the Trump challenge and explore the prospects for recently-formed new think tanks that challenge the hegemony of liberal internationalism and military interventionism.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Dr Atul Bhardwaj (City UoL; Institute of Chinese Studies, New Delhi): “American influence in Indian Political Development – from the New Deal to the New International Economic Order” (9.30-10.45)

Panel 1: Knowledge and Power I 11-12.45

Inderjeet Parmar (City, UoL; LSE): “American foundations, think tanks, and the liberal international order”

Nana DeGraaff (Vrije Univ, Amsterdam): “US think tanks, corporate networks and the Trumpian foreign policy elite”

Stephen Semler (Security Policy Reform Institute, Beirut/Berlin): “The crisis of liberal hegemony and the American think tank-scape today”

Or Rosenboim (City, UoL) “American visions of world order” (Paper to be circulated)

Lunch – 12.45-1.30

Panel Knowledge and Power II 1.30-3.00

Arun Kumar (York): "Meeting of Hearts and Minds? US Foundations, Elites, and their techno-managerial fantasies."

Martin Bayly (LSE): “Lineages of Indian International Thought: The Indian Council on World Affairs, and the ‘Pedagogy of Internationalism’”

Dayna Barnes (City, UoL): "American think tanks and occupation planning for Japan and Iraq"

Coffee – 3.00-3.30

Panel 3: Knowledge and Power III 3.30-5.15

Mark Ledwidge (Canterbury Christ Church): "Intellectual Warfare, the Colonial Project and Africa"

Bill Cooke (York): "America's Mission Statement: The Business School in Brazil and Beyond"

Katharina Rietzler (Sussex): "IR think tanks and the 'woman question' 1930-1960"

Giles Scott Smith (Leiden): 'The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the Obor Foundation, and the Dilemmas of Promoting 'Liberal Culture' in Indonesia'

Wine Reception (followed by speakers' dinner)

Abstracts and speaker biographies

Dayna Barnes

Considering an invasion of Iraq in 2002 and 2003, Americans pointed to post- 1945 Japan as proof that an enemy country could be remade into a stable democratic ally through a short military occupation. In the mid-twentieth century policy makers looked to the "failures" of the 1919 Versailles peace for potential pitfalls to avoid. At the dawn of the 21st century it was "lessons" from the "success" of the occupation of Japan (1945-1952) which provided the model for a post-Saddam Iraq. As they had during World War Two, planners and politicians drew on the input and analysis of think tank experts to inform their policy decisions. This talk will discuss how the use of outside experts in the planning process for Japan and Iraq differed, and with what implications for the occupied countries.

Dr. Dayna Barnes is a specialist in 20th century international history, American foreign policy, and East Asia. She is an assistant professor in modern history at City, University of London. Her first book, *Architects of Occupation: American Experts and the Planning for Postwar Japan*, was published by Cornell University Press in March 2017.

Martin Bayly

Decolonization was not only a moment of liberation from imperial power, but also symbolised the victory of an equally long-standing critique of imperial forms of knowledge or 'epistemic imperialism'. Such is the case with Indian international thought. Challenging the idea of a 1947 rupture moment, this paper traces the deeper histories of Indian scholars and activists thinking and writing internationally, including works of anti-colonial activists and their associated scholarly networks. Embedded in many of these texts is a notion of 'becoming international'. The paper describes this process as 'the pedagogy of internationalism', signifying not only India's entry into a world of independent states, but also her arrival in the global knowledge economy, untrammelled by

the restrictions of the past, and able to instruct herself independently in foreign and domestic affairs. Drawing upon Bruno Latour's notion of the 'purification' of knowledge the paper begins by briefly looking at some of the sources of international thinking in pre-independence India, highlighting the deep roots of Indian international thought that predated independence. The paper then moves on to describe how India's first independent international affairs think tank - the Indian Council on World Affairs – and its 1947 Asian Relations Conference can be seen as a culminating point to these various strands of knowledge in the transition to independence; both reflecting, and evolving within, a longer-standing tradition of Indian international thought.

Martin J Bayly is an Assistant Professor in International Relations Theory in the Department of International Relations at LSE, where he has taught International Relations since 2014. Martin has also taught at King's College London, where he completed his PhD in IR.

His research interests concern empire and International Relations in South Asia, with a particular emphasis on knowledge and expertise as a product of the colonial encounter. His first book, *Taming the Imperial Imagination*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2016, provides a new history of Anglo-Afghan relations in the nineteenth century showing how the British Empire in India sought to understand and control its peripheries through the use of colonial knowledge. The book was awarded the Francesco Guicciardini Prize in 2018 by the historical IR section of the International Studies Association.

His latest research proposes a global, intellectual, and institutional history of modern South Asian international thought as a product European and non-European dialogues of knowledge in the learned societies of colonial India. Concentrating on the Asiatic Society of Bengal, the United Services Institution, and the Indian Council on World Affairs, the research will examine these institutions as sites of a global encounter between mobile elites from both regions.

Bill Cooke

This paper reverses the direction of analysis in a paper published in 2015 with Rafael Alcadipani, which focussed on the establishment of Sao Paulo Business School (FGV-EAESP) in Brazil in the 1950s and 1960s. That showed how Brazilian actors were able to use FF funding to enable the financial viability of the school, rather than the specific project ends intended. Inter alia, it was case study of of Brazilian actors shaping an FF intervention to local ends. By constructing a prosopography, (or at least, a prosopographically informed) collective biography of the main US actors in the intervention (and 2015 article), their common and disparate pasts and futures, their network of shared and differentiated institutional affiliations their collective and individual agencies in support of US foreign policy are revealed. In so doing, whereas Cooke and Alcadipani set out the significance of the Americanization of business education in Brazil, this re-situating reveals more of the significance of Brazil in the Americanization of Business Education. Not least, it depicts the project as nexus, in a broader set of US interventions and activities in Brazil and worldwide. In this, the particular depiction of management education as ideology, offering a technocratic rationality to counter the appeal of the left as the only opposition to the oppressions of authoritarianism, imperialism and patrimonialism, is further developed.

Bill Cooke PhD is Chair of Strategic Management at the University of York, and also works as an Autonomous Scholar without affiliation. He researches the spread of managerialism over time and place, and other current projects include the failures of Stafford Cripps WWII vision for an egalitarian managerialism.

Nana de Graaff

The presidency of Donald Trump – often framed as a result of a populist revolt against the elites of Washington and Wall Street – and his apparent break with the postwar liberal internationalist foreign-policy elite consensus, has raised fundamental questions about the future of elite power in the USA and the implications for its global role. As established by previous research, America's foreign policy elite has in the past decades been closely connected to transnationally oriented corporate elite networks. In this talk, I address the question to what extent the Trump presidency represents a real rupture with these extant power structures in the American political system and its foreign-policy establishment, presenting the first systematic mapping and social network analysis of Trump, his cabinet and his White House advisers, which, based on a novel biographical data set, compares earlier findings on the elite networks of the Clinton, Bush and Obama administrations. While finding some strong continuities, the Trumpian foreign-policy elite is shown to display some very distinctive characteristics, particularly with respect to a lack of previous political affiliations, ties with a different kind of corporate elite, and a disconnect with the policy-planning networks (US think tanks) that have been so central to the previous administrations.

Nana de Graaff is an Associate Professor in International Relations at the Vrije Universiteit (VU), Amsterdam. Her research focuses on elite networks in politics, think tanks, and business, analysing power structures, foreign policy, and governance of the US and China. She publishes in leading social science journals such as *International Affairs*, *Review of International Political Economy* and *Global Networks*, profile: <https://research.vu.nl/en/persons/na-de-graaff>

Arun Kumar

Wanting to save India from communism, the Ford Foundation launched its first overseas office in New Delhi in 1952. As part of which, it funded research and training in various applied disciplines in the country – of which management is the focus of this paper. A wide range of actors including the Ford Foundation, researchers and consultants from leading Ivy League universities, Indian central and state governments, its economic elites, bureaucrats, etc. contributed to the establishment of various management institutions in the country between 1950s–80s. Departing from extant historiography which has presented this history in one of three ways—as ‘temples’ of Nehruvian post-colonial nation-building; a triumph of Americanization in what was an ‘essential democracy’ whose development outcomes were likely to determine the winners of the ongoing Cold War; or the making of ‘hybrid’ institutions—I present a largely concealed and contested history of management in India in this paper. Although desired on all sides: Indian and American, public and private, I note that their motivations of establishing management institutions in post-colonial India varied significantly. Management institutions, I argue, emerged on the narrow but consensual ground of techno-managerial modernization where interests on either side of the divide (sectoral or geographical) ultimately converged.

Arun Kumar is a Lecturer and Member, Interdisciplinary Global Development Centre at the University of York. He has researched and published histories of development in South Asia, particularly the role of business and management in it. He is finishing work on a research monograph (contracted with Oxford University Press) on economic elites' philanthropy and development in post/colonial India.

Mark Ledwidge

This new research project draws on the important work of Edward H. Berman in regard to his article *American Philanthropy and African Education: Towards an analysis*. The first strand of the project will explore the role of three American Foundations (Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie) in the promotion of both the theory and praxis that undergirded the creation, substance and ideological orientation of the educational institutions set up in post-colonial West Africa in Ghana and Nigeria. The project will explore Phillip Coomb's supposition that the work of U.S. foundations abroad represents The Fourth Dimension of U.S. Foreign Policy but said work is often ignored or portrayed as benign, expert, altruistic and beyond self-interest. The second strand of the project will examine and extend the scholarship of Prof Inderjeet Parmar by underlining the elitist and ideological values tacitly promoted by the Foundations. The project will reveal the symbiotic relationship between U.S. corporate actors, the foundations and the American State apparatus.

The third component of the project will define and decode the hidden bias embedded within the activities of the foundations. The project will illustrate the hegemonic character of the foundations' work through the prisms of race and ideology; by pinpointing the imperialist, exclusionary and colonial mindset directed towards Africans and African Americans and thereby exposing the significance of identity politics both at home and abroad. The study will assess the contention that U.S. foundations and the American establishment restricted the boundaries of the Civil Rights Movement by endorsing and legitimising a mainstream liberal agenda while undermining more radical issues like economic injustice and anti-imperialism; similarly, it will explore the foundations' role in managing the transition from colonialism to a neo-colonial paradigm bereft of the radical revolutionary nationalism that threatened the international status quo. In addition, the study will examine the foundations' post WWII efforts to champion the creation of African Studies depts within the subject portfolio of America's elite universities whilst simultaneously choosing to bypass the pre-existing Africanist programmes at Howard and Lincoln University.

Dr Mark Ledwidge studied at the University of Manchester (BA, MA and PhD). In 2011 Mark was appointed as Senior Lecturer in the Department of History and American Studies at CCCU. He has held four Research Fellowships: University of Manchester in 2008, the Rothermere American Institute (RAI) at Oxford University in 2012, City University of London 2014 and, currently, at the University of East Anglia's School of Politics, Philosophy, Language and Communication Studies. Mark's research interests encompass American politics, IR, U.S. foreign policy and the nexus between identity and power.

Mark's work on the relationship and impact of African-Americans on US foreign policy is an under-researched area of study and much of his work is ground-breaking, including his monograph *Race and U.S. Foreign Policy: the African-American Foreign Affairs Network, 1900-1960s* which was published in 2013 by Routledge UK (<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415705073/>). Mark is currently working on extending his interests to include an examination and analysis of elite studies with a view to highlighting the racial/ethnic dimension of C Wright Mill's power elite.

Inderjeet Parmar

American think tanks and their corporate-foundation sponsors, as well as elite networks, have been highly significant in key moments of the life of the liberal international order: at its conception and

creation in the aftermath of World War One and inter-war years; throughout the Second World War and subsequent cold war; from the end of the Cold War into the post-Cold War era; and during the current crisis of liberal international order. Liberal American think tanks and foundations are both symptoms and drivers of major domestic and global power shifts and they play key roles in managing change, developing concepts for governing, new strategic approaches and policies. Their fundamental power-technology is the “elite knowledge network” in and through which are created spaces for “thinkable thought”, construction of the boundaries of options for change, in which knowledge-for-use by policy makers is nurtured. Such elite networks house the core organisations and actors at the heart of what Antonio Gramsci calls “hegemonic projects” that conceptualise, develop, maintain, manage or recalibrate imperial power, challenging extant ways of explaining how think tanks, foundations, and power works in liberal-capitalist democratic societies. This chapter aims to elaborate and evidence the Gramscian case through consideration of three historical and contemporary instances – first, the transition from British to American racialised, elitist and imperial-hegemonic power through the roles of the (American) Council on Foreign Relations and (British) Chatham House in Paris 1919 and up to 1945; secondly, the roles of foundations and think tanks in the transition to post-Cold War “democracy promotion” or what some term a strategy of “liberal hegemony” to replace cold war containment; and thirdly, brief consideration of the politics and potential of the emerging Koch-Soros funded think tank – the Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft.

Inderjeet Parmar is Professor of International Politics at City, University of London Visiting Professor at the London School of Economics (2019-22), and Visiting Research Fellow at the Rothermere American Institute, University of Oxford (2019-20). He is a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences (FaCSS) and past President of the British International Studies Association. With Oliver Turner, Parmar has co-edited a forthcoming (February 2020) book: *The United States in the Indo-Pacific: Obama's Legacy and the Trump Transition* (Manchester University Press)

Parmar's most recent monograph, *Foundations of the American Century: Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* was published in 2012 by Columbia University Press and translated into Chinese and published by Peking University Press (2018). His current book project is entitled, *Presidents and Prime Minister at War: Race, Elitism and Empire in Anglo-American Wars from Korea to the Wars on Terror*.

Katharina Rietzler

IR think tanks have traditionally been, and continue to be, male-dominated environments. Research published in 2018 by the lobbying group Women in International Security has found that the most prominent U.S. foreign affairs think tanks feature a men-to-women ratio of about 3 to 1 when it comes to recruitment. This imbalance has a long history, a history in which the public discussion of affairs of state was very consciously designed as an arena of discourse that excluded women. However, women made important epistemological interventions in debates on what ‘studying the international’ meant in the formative years of IR, and women also spoke at think tanks that formally excluded them from membership. This paper focuses on a small group of women in the tightly networked transatlantic environment of IR think tanks, and assesses how the early emphasis on documentation in IR enabled women to shape this emerging discipline. Whether these activities can be recast as ‘international thought’ or IR theorizing is a moot point, yet analyzing the work of these women enables us to delve more deeply into often neglected epistemological debates in the mid-twentieth century.

Katharina Rietzler teaches American and international history at the University of Sussex. She holds a Ph.D. from University College London and has been a Mellon Fellow in American History at the University of Cambridge. She is the co-editor of *Women's International Thought: A New History* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).

Dr Or Rosenboim

In the mid-twentieth century, American think tanks provided vibrant and engaging environment for political debates about US foreign policy. Outside of the official vestiges of power, these organizations often enjoyed an easy access not only to a general audience but also to the political elite and leaders of the day. While some think tanks sought to offer advice to policy makers, others operated against conventional narratives in search of an alternative vision. In this study, I will reflect on the role of the Institute of Pacific Relation as a realm of international thought in the mid-twentieth century. In particular, I will focus on the figure of Owen Lattimore, who served as editor of the IPR's publication *Pacific Affairs*, to consider the role of this organization in shaping his geopolitical views and American foreign policy before the Second World War.

Dr Or Rosenboim is a Lecturer in Modern History and Director of the Centre for Modern History at City, University of London. She is the author of *The Emergence of Globalism: Visions of World Order in Britain and the United States, 1939-1950* (Princeton University Press, 2017), which was awarded the Guicciardini Prize for the best book in Historical International Relations (2019). She holds a PhD in Politics and International Studies (Cambridge), MSc (Oxford), and BA (Bologna) in Modern History. Her research was published in leading journals, exploring the history of international thought in the twentieth century, geopolitics, imperialism and the history of federalism and regionalism in the United States and Europe.

Stephen Semler

American domination of global power politics relies on the capitulation of the U.S. public. The promise of American-led international order has been security, broadly defined, but the 'national security' imperatives that enforce this order is increasingly viewed as hollow by the progressive left. International politics may come to be understood by this group in the same way as it understands domestic politics — as a fight over who gets what. In confronting this populist challenge, U.S. elites launder their political interest in maintaining the status quo through ostensibly non-political think tanks. While they continue to circumvent public approval for its policy prescriptions, these institutions have recently embraced a more public-facing approach to preserve the popular narratives that legitimize their ideas. With little evidence to connect 'national security' with the threats facing the U.S. working class, 'experts' across the think tank community have steadily deployed *human* security arguments to justify American imperialism: Regime change is marketed as an expression of solidarity with oppressed masses and the record-setting military budgets that make regime change possible are advertised as a savior for the middle and working class. After a survey of the actors and narratives of the U.S. foreign policy/national security think tank landscape, a positive model is offered. This 'model' think tank is conjured from the critiques of the structure, function, and ideology of the modern, establishment think tank.

Stephen Semler is co-founder of the Security Policy Reform Institute (SPRI), a grassroots-funded, progressive U.S. foreign policy think tank. SPRI is the product of his training in critical security studies

while in graduate school at American University of Beirut. Three of his former graduate school classmates join him as co-founders. Stephen has experience in U.S. federal government relations, nonprofit advocacy, forensic identification and tracing of conflict armaments, and analysis for the international humanitarian response for Syria. He lives in Beirut.

Giles Scott-Smith

Ivan Kats is a little-known figure in international history, yet his skills as editor, networker, fundraiser, and cultural troubadour have left their mark on modern Indonesian culture. A member of the Congress for Cultural Freedom's secretariat in Paris during the 1960s, Kats oversaw the CCF's (Ford Foundation- and, earlier, CIA-funded) cultural projects in SE Asia to spread Western liberal ideals among restless post-colonial intellectual elites. Exiting from Paris when the CIA connection became known, Kats relocated to Yale and set about creating a successor operation managed through his newly-established Obor Foundation. From the 1970s to the 1990s Kats, via Obor, had a profound influence in Indonesia as the Suharto regime sought to shape a new national identity through a carefully monitored culture industry. Obor continues to this day and over the years has developed close ties with Leiden University. This paper explores Kats' role as a privateer 'cultural diplomat' in the service of Cold War anti-communism, corporate interests, and philanthropy, attempting to assist his Indonesian colleagues in their search for an authentic post-colonial culture.

Giles Scott-Smith is the Roosevelt Chair in New Diplomatic History at Leiden University. He serves as the Academic Director of the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies. Having received his PhD in International Relations from Lancaster University (1998), he has since then taught and researched both IR and International History in the Netherlands. From 2009-2018 he held the Ernst van der Beugel Chair in the Diplomatic History of Transatlantic Relations since WW II at Leiden University.