1

Introduction: Framing Asian Studies

Albert Tzeng, William L. Richter and
Ekaterina Koldunova

"Asian Studies", whether broadly defined as the production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge about Asia or narrowly limited to the specific field of study named as such, has constantly been framed by a changing geopolitical context. The term "geopolitics", borrowed from the study of international relations, denotes a perspective of considering power relations as embedded in the spatial structure (size, distance, adjacency) of geographical territories. By "framing", we refer to the process by which a configuration of contextual factors (economic, political, cultural, historical or organizational) leads to an inclination towards a particular pattern of knowledge.

This point is illustrated by considering the colonial roots of Oriental or Asiatic scholarship, the war-driven migration of Asian scholars and the dispersion of their expertise, and Cold War American investment in both social sciences in East Asia and in "Asian Studies" at home. The rising scholarly interest in Japan, China and India following their growing political-economic significance in recent decades, as well as the emergence of various "alternative discourses" and "inter-Asia dialogues" as attempts at intellectual decolonization, provide further examples.

This framing effect is at least partially mediated by various institutions involved in the social process of knowledge production — such as foundations, professional associations, publishers, journals, research institutes, cultural societies, governments and multinational entities. These institutions operate in ways that reflect their roles, agendas and power relations within the geopolitical context, and leave their imprints, through funding and agenda setting, on their associated scholarly networks and subsequently the intellectual landscape of human knowledge about Asia.

While institutions often can be seen as mechanisms by which geopolitical priorities help to frame Asian Studies, it is important to recognize that institutions and their associated networks can also be centres of opposition to the prevailing foreign policies and their geopolitical underpinnings.

Investigating these themes further invites critical examination of the power structure underlying this knowledge: Who has written about Asia — for what and for whom? Where has Asian knowledge been disseminated and consumed? Which (institutional, societal-structural, national) interests and biases have been brought into knowledge production? Which topics have been emphasized or excluded? Even the term "Asia" as an epistemological unit is subject to question, in part for its historical roots in being associated with European perspectives for more than two millennia.

Asian Studies in Changing Contexts

Asian Studies has roots that can be traced back to the European colonial interest in Asia, or the Orient, and the indigenous intellectual attempts to resist colonial dominance through promoting forms of pan-Asianism. But as an institutionalized field of inquiry it was largely developed in the special geopolitical circumstances following World War II — the rapid dismantling of colonial empires; the proliferation of "new nations" in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere; and Cold War competition between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Cold War confrontation of the two camps in East and Southeast Asia created strong demand for knowledge about the region, as well as the political legitimacy for the spending to meet this demand.

Scholars from both sides were sent to investigate and survey their allied countries. Institutionalized Asian Studies were rapidly developed in both the United States and the Soviet Union. Moreover, the competition for ideological domination provided the imperative to invest in education in societies close to the confrontation line.

The end of the Cold War, whether measured by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 or the break-up of the Soviet Union in 1991, challenged the necessity of Asian Studies and area studies in general. In particular, the decline of United States' federal funding became a major concern of area studies centres and scholars.

But there were also issues of globalization, questions of academic priorities, and new theoretical directions (Ludden 1997). Globalization, some argued, was creating a "flat" and more homogenous world in which area-specific knowledge would become increasingly irrelevant (Friedman 2005). Traditional academic disciplines questioned the allocation of scarce resources to interdisciplinary area studies programmes. New funding initiatives and approaches brought additional challenges to what had become familiar area studies frameworks.

These post–Cold War challenges triggered debate about the future of area studies, including Asian Studies. Some writers went so far as to pronounce Asian Studies moribund and to speculate on what might be its "afterlife":

> Like those jerrybuilt temporary buildings thrown up on so many campuses during World War II, area studies outlived the original reason for its construction and has become an entrenched structure that maintains the separation of area expertise from general knowledge. (Harootunian and Miyoshi 2002, p. 6)

Nonetheless, Asian Studies — and area studies generally — appears to have survived the dire assessments of its impending irrelevance and demise for several reasons:

First, the 11 September 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon marked something of a turning point by ushering in the "War on Terror" and revealing the need for language skills and area-specific knowledge. This need for Asian knowledge was repeatedly emphasized by ongoing conflicts in the Middle East, tension on the Korean Peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait, and mounting pressure in the South China Sea.

Second, the economic and political performance of Japan, China, India and other Asian countries also attracted continuing interest in studying them. In particular, the development models adopted by China and India had huge effects on their respective regions, and even on the international system, adding significance to the study of these countries and regions.

Third, with the passage of time the world turned out to be not so "flat" as some globalists had predicted. Alternative variants of regionalization, most of all visible in Asia, brought back to the research agenda the issues of the proper balancing of general and specific knowledge and of the spatial factor in world politics (Voskressenski 2017).

Finally, the prosperity of some areas of Asia demonstrated the growing influences of promoting Asian Studies — countries like Japan, Taiwan and China helping to fund studies of their respective cultures in other countries. A number of Asia-focused journals, like *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, have flourished, with cooperation between Asian and Western scholars as well as international collaboration within Asia. The rise of universities across an economically booming Asia in the 1990s onwards and their efforts to internationalize Asian research and education also contributed to the development of Asian Studies.

The expansion of Asian Studies in Europe, in Asia itself, and indeed throughout the world, manifests the thriving presence of Asian Studies. To paraphrase one book title, Asian Studies has become "decentred" and "diversified" (Goh 2011).

There are several institutions that play pivotal roles in maintaining networks of Asian Studies scholars. The creation of the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS) in Leiden and its companion International Convention of Asian Scholars (ICAS) helped to expand both European and Asian scholarly participation in Asian Studies. The biennial ICAS conferences attract around a thousand participants each year from between thirty-five and fifty-three countries. The ICAS Book Prize, established in 2004, received "approximately 50 dissertations and more than 200 books" submissions for the 2015 contest. By February 2017 it had received 330 English-language books and 126 dissertations for that year's round.[1]

Similarly, the U.S.-based Association for Asian Studies (AAS) now annually convenes an "AAS in Asia" conference at a site in Asia. The AAS itself now has more than seven thousand registered members. In 2011 the AAS held a joint conference with ICAS in Honolulu. This enlarged event attracted five thousand participants. The International Studies Association, an interdisciplinary professional network focused on international affairs, recently started a vigorous debate on Asia's possible impact on the understanding of international relations.

In short, Asian Studies appears to be alive and well, at least according to these broad measures. Asian Studies has become polycentric and more diverse. If the Asian Studies of half a century ago was framed primarily by Cold War geopolitics, present-day Asian Studies may be seen to be shaped by much more diverse, decentralized and complex geopolitics, as several of the following chapters demonstrate.

The "Framing Asian Studies" Conference

The current volume originates from the conference "Framing Asian Studies: Geopolitics, Institutions and Networks" held in Leiden, the Netherlands, 18–20 November 2013. The conference was jointly hosted by the IIAS and the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) and was convened by Albert Tzeng, at that time an IIAS and ISEAS postdoctoral Fellow.

The theme of the conference grew directly out of the subject of Tzeng's doctoral dissertation, "Framing Sociology in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore: Geopolitics, States and Practitioners". In that study, Tzeng traced how sociology as a Western discipline had been introduced, institutionalized and developed in the three Asian societies. It related observed patterns to regional geopolitical factors (e.g., the Chinese Civil War, the Cold War and decolonization) and the distinctive contexts of the three places.

Anchored within the broad tradition of "sociology of knowledge", Tzeng's dissertation started with a review of numerous approaches to theorizing about the social sciences in Asia — orientalism, Eurocentrism, post-colonialism, Captive Mind, intellectual imperialism, academic dependency theory and some others. However, he found these approaches limited by their built-in dualistic image of an East–West

dichotomy and an inability to deal with more sophisticated patterns of multi-site knowledge flow. Tzeng therefore drew upon ideas of the "world system" (Wallerstein 1974), "network society" (Castells 1996), the knowledge network (Altbach 1998) and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1993) to propose a *world system of knowledge network* as an overarching conceptual frame for narrating the historical expansion of the knowledge enterprise from medieval European universities to a vast global network of knowledge production and dissemination.

The conference was conceived by appropriating this analytical framework to inquiries about the social framing of Asian Studies. The conference theme situated the production and dissemination of knowledge about Asia within the "world system of knowledge network". Geopolitical contexts were central to the discussion, but for this broad treatment of Asian Studies it was important to pay attention to a wider array of institutions that include both the state-centric and the transnational; and it was important to focus more on their networks than on individual actors.

The call for papers invited applicants to explore:

- The influence of geopolitical factors on how knowledge about Asia is produced and disseminated: colonialism and its legacy, wars and regional conflicts, the Cold War structure, and the "knowledge economy" competition in the new era of globalization.
- The role of various institutions in promoting and directing Asian Studies: foundations, professional associations, publishers, journals, research institutes, governments and multinational entities.
- The outlook of various knowledge networks, including both (a) macroscopic investigations on the patterns and developmental trajectory of knowledge networks measured in terms of flows of scholars/students, capital and knowledge, and (b) case studies of particular networks of institutions or people on Asian Studies.
- Critiques of the power structure underlying the observed patterns of knowledge production and dissemination of Asian Studies, including consideration of fundamental questions like: Knowledge for what? Knowledge for whom? Whose interests were represented or excluded? How relevant and appropriate is it to use "Asia" as an epistemological unit?

Altogether, 140 abstracts were received from 39 countries, of which 71 were from Asia, 36 from Europe, 16 from the United States, 10 from Australia and New Zealand, and the rest from elsewhere. Submissions from Asia mostly came from the "southeast coastal belt" that included South, Southeast and East Asia. The distribution pattern roughly reflected the geographical span of the scholarly network associated with the two organizing institutions.

Thirty-four submissions were selected to be presented in the conference — which consisted of nine thematic sessions over three days — of which eleven papers were further selected to be included in the present volume.[2] Tzeng also invited William L. Richter, Professor Emeritus of Kansas State University, and Ekaterina Kuldunova, Associate Professor of MGIMO University, to join the editorial team for this book.

The primary criterion for selection was each paper's potential to make sharp points or to raise critical questions about the interplay of geopolitics, institutions and scholarly networks in framing the outlook of knowledge about Asia. It was also advantageous to have papers that were clearly written and in a relatively complete form at the time of the conference. A minor consideration was to achieve a degree of geographical and thematic diversity as represented in the conference. The resulting volume was not intended to be a complete survey, but rather a sample of interesting case studies to advance understanding of the subject.

Most of the selected papers incorporated geopolitical factors in their analysis, while several discussed the role of particular institutions. However, the third topic, "knowledge network", received little attention and was dropped from the book title.

Structure of the Book

The chapters in the present volume are presented in four sections. The first section focuses on "Asia" as a contested subject. It not only traces the framing of Asian Studies back to the multiple traditions of Oriental Studies in Europe, but also explores the variant geographical framing of Asia. The second section explores the geopolitical framing of Western discourses on Asia. The three chapters included take Java,

Cambodia and Taiwan as examples of how scholarly or even public media representation of them in the United States or Europe have been shaped by the changing geopolitical contexts. The third section turns to Russia and Lithuania, two former Soviet states, and demonstrates how the historical trajectories of their Asian Studies also reflect their changing geopolitical positions. The final section, titled "Inter-Asian Gazes", includes three case studies on the generation of Asian knowledge within Asia.

I. Contested "Asia"

"Asia is not one", as Amitav Acharya (2010) reminds us, "there is no singular idea of Asia". The notion of Asia is characterised by "fuzziness and incoherence" and is "essentially contested" (Acharya 2010). Asia is contested in multiple ways. Like other large landmasses, Asia has been claimed and fought over for centuries by indigenous and intrusive political powers. Despite the present-day universality of a system of states, interstate boundaries continue in many places to be unresolved or challenged by ethnicity or ideology. The meaning of Asia has been contested among colonial writers, between colonizers and colonized, and among post-colonial countries. Its geographical definition is also a matter of contestation (Lewis and Wigen 1997). Is it a single entity or several (Duara 2013)? Does it make sense as a geographic concept? What constitutes the boundaries of Asia?

The three chapters in section I explore some of these aspects of contested Asia.

Maitreyee Choudhury, in chapter 2, traces the European roots of Asian Studies in English, Dutch, French, German and other traditions of Oriental Studies. Her broad historical overview of the European orientalist tradition draws upon Edward Said's critique of orientalism (Said 1978), but it also shows how Said fails to account for certain aspects of the orientalist tradition. In addition to her summary of the historical development of orientalist institutions in Western Europe, the United States, and elsewhere, she provides a more detailed study of the Oriental Society of Bengal, which was something of a prototype for later orientalist institutions.

After considering the historical orientalist background to the development of Asian Studies in the last half of the twentieth century, Choudhury looks at some of the geopolitical factors that helped to frame and reframe Asian Studies in the decades following World War II. She notes the importance of the Cold War, 9/11, the expanding numbers of Asian scholars on Asia, and other factors that have helped to explain the vicissitudes of Asian Studies over the last six or seven decades.

She argues that these changes in Asian Studies have brought about a "metamorphosis of the Western mind". Geopolitics has framed Asian Studies, but Asian Studies has in turn shaped how Europeans and Americans view Asia. If she is correct in this argument, might we speak with equal validity of Asian Studies leading to a "metamorphosis of the Asian mind"?

Kirrilee Hughes in chapter 3 reflects on Australia's "Asia literacy" programme and its relevance to our understanding of "Asia", "Australia", and area studies. Central to her discussion is the widespread "metageographical" perception that Asia and Australia are two separate geographic entities. To some extent, Asia literacy challenges the absoluteness of this notion by asserting a degree of shared identity and shared interests, based in part on geographic proximity. Hughes draws on the concepts of *metageography* (Lewis and Wigan 1997) to highlight the contestability of geographic givens, such as Asia, and *hybridity* (Ang 2001) to explore the impact of Asia literacy on Australian society.

Hughes suggests an interesting but complex interplay among geopolitics, Asian Studies, Australia's Asia literacy project, and the very meanings of Asia and Australia. The post–World War II geopolitics of the United States were important in framing the areas of today's area studies, including East Asia and Southeast Asia. The development of Asian Studies programmes in Australian institutions of higher education helped to frame the Asia literacy initiative. Asia literacy is helping to reframe both Asia and Australian identity.

William Richter in chapter 4 explores the question of how Asia and South Asia are "constructed" by something as commonplace as the maps found on covers of books and professional journals and in the logos of professional associations. Drawing on metageography, cartography and postmodern social theories, Richter argues that cover illustrations and logos reflect socially constructed "mental maps"

rather than any intention of authors, illustrators or publishers to shape geographic perceptions.

Richter explores differences between "atlas" definitions and the "geopolitical" portrayal of Asia and South Asia in cover illustrations and logos. He also shows how such representations have changed over just a few decades. Processes of framing and reframing Asia and Asian Studies, he argues, are ongoing.

II. Geopolitical Framing of Western Discourses

Geopolitics began in the nineteenth century as an attempt to establish an objective geographic science of statecraft (Cohen 2002). Ironically, the "science" of geopolitics was itself shaped by the same imperial forces and motivations that gave rise to orientalism. Sir Halford Mackinder's famous "heartland" doctrine — that whichever power controlled the Eurasian "heartland" would control the world — reflected decades of British imperial competition with Russia in Central Asia. American Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan developed a geopolitical theory of sea power that helped justify President Theodore Roosevelt's expansion of U.S. naval forces. German Karl Haushofer adapted Mackinder to create a *Geopolitik* in support of Hitler's Third Reich. American Nicholas Spykman countered Mackinder's Heartland theory with a "Rimland" theory that later became a significant basis for the application to Asia of the United States' Cold War doctrine of containment.

The recognition that geopolitics might differ from country to country (Dodds and Atkinson 2000) has led to the contemporary study of critical geopolitics (Tuathail 1996; Derluguian and Greer 2000). Like Asian Studies, Geopolitics (as a set of theories or field of study) is itself framed by geopolitics (as real and/or perceived political conditions).

We tend to speak of geopolitical eras. Orientalism developed in the era of European colonialism. Area studies developed in the Cold War era, faced major challenges in the brief period between the end of the Cold War and 9/11, and continues to evolve in the post-9/11 era. These broad generalizations, of course, mask a lot of temporal and geographic complexity. As Choudhury notes in chapter 2, the orientalism of William Jones in the late eighteenth century was very different from that in the time of Rudyard Kipling a century later. The chapters in section II explore some of this complexity.

In chapter 6, Riwanto Tirtosudarmo looks at American scholarly treatment of Javanese Islam over a period encompassing both the Cold War and the War on Terror. This is a period in which a changing geopolitics has made for a "changing context of area studies" (Bonura and Sears 2007). Indonesia is the largest country in Southeast Asia, the third-largest country in Asia and the largest Muslim country in the world. Java is a major island component of Indonesia, and Islam has been politically relevant both to democratization issues during the Cold War and, especially, to "clash of civilizations" concerns during the post-9/11 era.

Tirtosudarmo considers the writings of three American scholars whose books have been prominent in analysing and interpreting Javanese Islam to Americans and the wider world. The three are Clifford Geertz, Robert Hefner and Merle Ricklefs. Tirtosudarmo is of course cognizant of non-American scholars writing on Islam in Indonesia, but focuses on these three to discern the extent to which the changing geopolitical context is reflected in their writings.

The chapter shows connections between the categories with which Geertz analysed Javanese Islam and important Cold War issues and events, including democratization, modernization, and the anti-Communist massacres of 1965. It also shows links between the later writings of Hefner and Ricklefs and their changed geopolitical environments. However, there is also a notable continuity in analysis from Geertz to Hefner to Ricklefs. Geopolitics frames their successive studies of Javanese Islam in identifiable ways, but the categories of the earlier period are largely carried forward into the later one.

In chapter 7, Gea Wijers explores the ways in which the dynamics of geopolitics helped frame media reporting on the Cambodian situation during the Khmer Rouge takeover (1975–79) and the Vietnamese intervention (1979–89). Her chapter illustrates how social constructions such as historical relationships, the accepted media discourse and scholarship "traditions" can contribute to perceptions of Cambodian "genocide" as well as influence the resettlement of Cambodian refugees.

Comparing France, its former colonizer, and the United States in their media reporting and scholarly traditions, Wijers provides additional evidence that the subjects compiled in Asian Studies are not established in a neutral process but are affected by temporal

variations in internal and external political constellations and public opinion. She illustrates this with a look at Cambodian refugee resettlement experiences in Lyons, France, and in Long Beach, California (USA), drawing on field research in both communities.

Wijers broadens the scope of Asian Studies by moving beyond its academic impact and acknowledging the role of the zeitgeist on research perceptions, output and societal outcomes. She concludes that lack of attention to the true complexity of Cambodian affairs at the time helped shape a limited view on "genocides" that exists to this day.

Hardina Ohlendorf, in chapter 7, looks at the special case of Taiwan Studies, "a relatively new field of research" that she claims "challenges the conventional models of area studies". In contrast to the long orientalist traditions preceding most other Asian Studies programmes, Taiwan Studies emerged as a distinct field of studies since the late 1980s — a time when the general legitimacy of area studies was challenged for their connection with colonialism or American hegemony. "The institutionalized academic study of Taiwan as a distinct region", she writes, "has primarily been locally driven, in a bottom-up fashion, with academics challenging the prevalent perspective on Taiwan as being part of and congruent with China." Their motivation, she found, was directly linked to the changing national identity in Taiwan.

Ohlendorf compares the development of Taiwan Studies in the United States and in Europe and demonstrates how their geopolitical connection with Taiwan intertwined with the development of Taiwan Studies in both settings. But more importantly it was the political developments in Taiwan that gave greater impetus to the development of Taiwan Studies in the West, as most academics in this field rely on research funding from Taiwan. She argues that this case represents a new mode of area studies that is motivated largely by the subject studied, and describes it as "area studies in reverse".

In her conclusion, Ohlendorf raises additional questions concerning the ethical challenges faced by Taiwan Studies researchers who directly or indirectly receive funding from the country they are studying. These questions are particularly relevant to a society like Taiwan, whose political status and identity are contested, but in a broader sense they raise issues that area studies researchers should consider in any political setting.

III. Asian Studies in Former Soviet States

Most discussions of area studies, including Asian Studies, focus on how Americans and Western Europeans view the respective regions. Much less attention has been paid to the development of Asian Studies, or of specific Asian regions, in former Soviet societies or in other "non-Western" scholarly communities.

The two chapters in this section consider aspects of Asian Studies in two former Soviet countries — Russia and Lithuania. Some works on Russian orientalism have appeared in English (Tolz 2011; Schimmelpenninck van der Oye 2010), but little or nothing on Asian Studies in smaller European countries like Lithuania. The chapters by Ekaterina Koldunova and Valdas Jaskūnas not only fill major gaps in understanding of the subject but also suggest interesting comparisons — both similarities and differences — with the development of Asian Studies in the United States, Western Europe and Asia.

The chapter by Koldunova focuses on Southeast Asian Studies in Russia and traces the evolution of this field through three broad historical periods: pre-Soviet (or Imperial, prior to 1917), Soviet (1917–89) and post-Soviet (since 1989). When Imperial Russia expanded into its adjacent territories in Central and Northeastern Asia in the nineteenth century, Russian explorers also established ties and created interest in the lands of Southeast Asia. Full development of Southeast Asian Studies came only in the Soviet period, especially after World War II (as in the United States), but came under serious threats with the political and economic challenges of the 1990s (as in the United States, but even more so). This case shows that Asian Studies in Russia, like their counterparts in the West, have also been framed by geopolitics.

However, Koldunova also demonstrates the resilience of academic institutions and scholarly networks in the changing context. They helped to weather these challenges and to adapt Southeast Asian Studies to new circumstances. Geopolitical factors frame Asian Studies, but institutions and scholarly networks also help to frame geopolitics as well as Asian Studies.

Jaskūnas looks at Indian studies in Lithuania and relates the long tradition of scholarly interest in India to Lithuania's special circumstances — lengthy periods of statelessness and of subjection to

Soviet domination. Lithuania developed an "inward orientalism", he argues, in contrast to the outward orientalism of such colonial powers as England, France and the Netherlands. Lithuanians initially found affinity with India in the Indo-European links between the Lithuanian language and Sanskrit, but also identified with India as a country subjected to foreign rule. For Lithuanians, Soviet Russia rather than India was seen as "the Other". Geopolitics framed Indian studies in Lithuania, but it was the geopolitics of a small country with a history of statelessness and subjection to foreign rule.

Jaskūnas also shows that the institutions involved in Asian Studies are also shaped by these geopolitical circumstances. Lithuanians interested in India were not fully free to develop Indian studies within their formal academic institutions, so they pursued their interests through politically acceptable channels such as the Lithuanian Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries.

IV. Inter-Asia Gazes

The final section focuses on the framing of Asian knowledge within Asia. The three studies included here demonstrate how intellectuals, administrators and scholars in selected Asian countries have viewed their Asian neighbours.

Brij Tankha, in chapter 10, looks at the evolution of Indian views towards Asia and Asian Studies, with particular focus on Indian perspectives on Japan and China. He shows how leading Indian intellectuals during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries shaped notions of Asian identity.

Changed geopolitical circumstances following World War II, especially independence from colonial rule, helped to erode these pan-Asian identities, however. Ideas of a shared "Asianness" were further damaged as Sino–Indian relations soured in the late 1950s and broke into open warfare in 1962. Whereas the earlier pan-Asianism might have predicted a strong interest in Asian Studies following independence, the result has been much more modest. Tankha shows that the study of Japan and China in independent India has been more limited and more practical than cultural (e.g., with priorities on language study rather

than learning about societies and cultures of other Asian countries). He also shows that India has been relatively slow to develop educational exchanges with other Asian countries, at least with those outside its immediate "neighbourhood" or security perimeter.

However, Tankha notes, there appears to be a recent resurgence in Indian interest in Asian Studies. It is yet unclear how strong this will be or what geopolitical factors might be at play. If and when Asian Studies become a more vibrant component of Indian academic institutions they will have a rich pre-independence intellectual tradition to draw upon.

Huei-Ying Kuo's chapter compares British and Japanese classification systems for "South Seas Chinese" — what today would generally be called ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia. Kuo's analysis actually entails two dimensions of comparison. British practice evolved during the period of colonial rule, so Kuo employs both a temporal comparison of early British classification patterns with later ones and the cross-country comparison of British and Japanese categories. In both dimensions of analysis, she explores the social, political and geopolitical factors that help to explain the differences.

Kuo uses imperial census records and related official statements to identify and interpret British classification practices. Comparable administrative resources do not exist for the Japanese, who were not in a similar colonial role in Southeast Asia, so Kuo draws upon scholarly, journalistic and commercial sources to identify and explain Japanese perceptions. Her methodology demonstrates imaginative use of evidence from institutions (British imperial census records) and networks (Japanese scholarly and other writings) to discern geopolitical and political framing of valuable area studies knowledge.

Claire Seungeun Lee in chapter 12 compares the development of Chinese studies in neighbouring countries, Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK). For both countries, China is a large and important neighbour. She finds interesting differences in the development of the area studies "knowledge industries", not only between the two countries but also within each country over time.

Lee notes a variety of types of geopolitical factors that have helped to shape Chinese studies in the two countries. One has been the changing political status of Taiwan and the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the timing of Japanese and Korean normalization

of relations with the PRC. Another has been each country's historical role in Asia. Japan's history of imperial rule over Korea, Taiwan and parts of mainland China, for instance, gave it a much longer tradition of "Sinology" than existed in the ROK.

As some of the other chapters in this volume demonstrate, geopolitics can frame Asian Studies in complex ways. In the case of Chinese studies in Japan and Korea, Lee shows, the geopolitics of both the host countries and the area being studied have shaped the educational institutions and scholarly networks involved in area studies.

Summary

This book explores the interconnection between geopolitical context and the ways this context frames our knowledge about Asia, highlighting previously neglected cause–effect relations. In addition, the work also examines how various knowledge institutions (e.g., foundations, associations, institutes, publishers and archives) promote and shape Asian Studies. To do this the authors look at a number of cases ranging from colonial impact and Western approaches to Asia to the current state of Asian Studies in Asian countries themselves.

Going beyond simple accounts of the discipline's development, the authors seek to explain why Asian Studies and its subfields developed in the way they did and what the current implications of these transformations might be on intellectual and political understandings of Asia.

The work contributes to existing knowledge by building on the current debates on the decolonization and de-imperialization of knowledge about Asia (Chen 2010; Wang 2011). However, it proposes a more multifaceted view rather than just examining the impact of the West on the framing of Asian Studies.

Notes

1. Data provided in email communication with Doreen Ilozor at AAS and Paul van der Velde at IIAS/ICAS, February 2017.
2. At least two conference papers not included in this volume have been published elsewhere as journal articles (Barter 2015; Das 2015).

References

Acharya, Amitav. "Asia Is Not One". *Journal of Asian Studies* 69, no. 4 (November 2010): 1001–13.

Altbach, Philip B. *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*. Westport, CT: Ablex, 1998.

Ang, Ien. *On Not Speaking Chinese*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Barter, Shane J. "Geographical Record. Area Studies, Asian Studies, and the Pacific Basin". *Geographical Review* 105, no. 1 (January 2015): 105–19.

Bonura, Carlo, and Laurie J. Sears. "Introduction: Knowledges that Travel in Southeast Asian Studies". In *Knowing Southeast Asian Subjects*, edited by Laurie J. Sears, pp. 1–32. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Castells, Manuel. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, vol. 1, *The Rise of the Network Society*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.

Chen Kuan-Hsing. *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Chou, Cynthia, and Vincent Houben. *Southeast Asian Studies: Debates and New Directions*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2006.

Cohen, Saul Bernard. *Geopolitics of the World System.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Das, Anup Kumar. "Mapping of University Presses in India: Pattern of Knowledge Production and Dissemination". *Annals of Library and Information Studies* 62, no. 2 (2015): 57–67.

Derluguian, Georgi M., and Scott L. Greer. *Questioning Geopolitics: Political Projects in a Changing World-System*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2000.

Dodds, Klaus, and David Atkinson, eds., *Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Duara, Prasenjit, ed. *Asia Redux: Conceptualizing a Region for Our Times*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2013.

Friedman, Thomas L. *The World is Flat: A Short History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Goh Beng-Lan, ed. *Decentring and Diversifying Southeast Asian Studies: Perspectives from the Region*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2011.

Harootunian, H.D., and Masao Miyoshi. "Introduction: The 'Afterlife' of Area Studies". In *Learning Places: The Afterlife of Area Studies.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

Kratoska, Paul H., Remco Baben, and Henk Schulte Nordholt, eds. *Locating Southeast Asia: Geographics of Knowledge and Politics of Space*. Singapore: Singapore University Press, 2005.

Lewis, Martin W., and Kären W. Wigen. *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Ludden, David. "The Territoriality of Knowledge and the History of Area Studies". University of Pennsylvania, 6 December 1997 <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~dludden/areast1.htm> (accessed 7 August 2013).

Miyoshi, Masao, and H.D. Harootunian, eds. *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

Noor, Farish A. *The Discursive Construction of Southeast Asia in 19th Century Colonial–Capitalist Discourse*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016.

Park Seung Woo and Victor T. King, eds. *The Historical Construction of Southeast Asian Studies: Korea and Beyond*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2013.

Reid, Anthony, ed. *Southeast Asian Studies: Pacific Perspectives*. Tempe: Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 2003.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.

Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, David. *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010

Spykman, Nicholas. *American Strategy in World Politics.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1942.

Stremmelaar, Josine, and Paul van der Velde, eds. *What About Asia?* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Tolz, Vera. *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Tuathail, Gearóid Ó [Gerard Toal]. *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Voskressenski, Alexei D. *Non-Western Theories of International Relations: Conceptualizing World Regional Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Wang Hui. *The Politics of Imagining Asia*, edited by Theodore Huters. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.