UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
INTERNATIONAL AND AREA STUDIES

The Politics of Knowledge

Area Studies and the Disciplines

EDITED BY
DAVID SZANTON

Introduction

The Origin, Nature, and Challenges of Area Studies in the United States

David L. Szanton

In his essay that follows, Alan Tansman notes that Area Studies is a form of translation; "an enterprise seeking to know, analyze, and interpret foreign cultures through a multidisciplinary lens." "To know, analyze, and interpret" another culture—whether an American seeking to understand China, or an Angolan seeking to understand India—is inevitably an act of translation. It is primarily an effort to make the assumptions, meanings, structures, and dynamics of another society and culture comprehensible to an outsider. But it also creates reflexive opportunities to expand, even challenge by the contrast, the outsider's understanding of his or her own society and culture. The "multidisciplinary lens" is essential because no single academic discipline is capable of capturing and conveying a full understanding of another society or culture.

Good translations of any text—whether a poem, a speech, a social event, or a culture—must begin with a serious attempt to understand the text's structures, meanings, and dynamics. The text must be set in its own language and history, in its prior texts and current contexts to avoid simply imposing one's own meanings or expectations on it. Perfect translations are rarely possible, something is almost always lost in translation; rough or partial translations are the best we can expect. Inevitably, translations from or of even very distant languages and cultures will produce some familiar ideas and images, and will support some familiar concepts and propositions. But they will also almost certainly generate some surprises. Merely finding or imposing our own selves, structures, or dynamics in another culture—in effect, reading it as a Rorschach inkblot onto which we project our

own experience—only tells us about ourselves. It also probably means that we have missed whatever we might have learned from it. Such failures to understand—or projections onto—other societies and cultures often result from forms of ethnocentrism. This seems a particular danger in the US given its powerful and now seemingly hegemonic socio-economic and political position. All too often US social scientists and humanists have proclaimed universals or imposed on other parts of the world concepts, theories, models, and analytic fashions derived from West European or US experience. At one level this is readily understandable; seriously seeking the diverse and alternative knowledges and experiences of other cultures and societies can be deeply challenging, decentering, and threatening. But doing so can also help deparochialize understandings, and illuminate the world, the other, and ultimately, one's own society and self.

This volume argues that the fundamental role of Area Studies in the United States has been—and continues to be—to deparochialize US- and Euro-centric visions of the world in the core social science and humanities disciplines, among policy makers, and in the public at large. Within the US university, Area Studies scholarship attempts to document the existence, internal logic, and theoretical implications of the distinctive social and cultural values, expressions, structures, and dynamics that shape the societies and nations beyond Europe and the United States. The broad goals are twofold. One, to generate new knowledge and new forms of knowledge for their intrinsic and practical value. Two, and more reflexively, to historicize and contextualize—in effect, to de-naturalize—the formulations and universalizing tendencies of the US social science and humanities disciplines which continue to draw largely on US and European experience. When successful, Area Studies research and teaching demonstrates the limitations of fashioning analyses based largely on the particular and contingent histories, structures, power formations, and selective, and often idealized, narratives of "the West." Still more ambitiously, Area Studies can provide the materials and ideas to help reconstruct the disciplines so that they become more inclusive and more effective tools for social and cultural analysis.

Area Studies communities have not always succeeded in this;

there have been many failures, and other agendas as well. As an intellectual movement, Area Studies has been heterogeneous and itself must be historicised, contextualized, and continually reconstructed to meet the changing dynamics of the world. But the deparochialization of the US social sciences and humanities has been a central concern from the beginning.[1] Furthermore, given post-1989 Western triumphalism, intertwined with current processes and claims of economic, social and cultural "globalization," reinvigorating and recasting Area Studies to meet its original goal of translating back to us the continuing diversities of the world is an ever more complex and challenging intellectual and political enterprise.

Within the universities of the United States Area Studies represents a major social invention. Area Studies research and teaching on Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and the Soviet Union has repeatedly challenged the institutional and the intellectual hegemony of the US and Euro-centric social science and humanities disciplines. By generating new kinds of data, questions, and insights into social formations, political dynamics, and cultural constructions (e.g. Anderson's "Imagined Communities," The Rudolphs' "Modernity of Tradition," Geertz' "Theatre State," O'Donnell's "Bureaucratic Authoritarianism", Scott's "Weapons of the Weak" Turner's "Liminal Spaces"), Area Studies scholars have frequently undermined received wisdom and established theories, replacing them with more context sensitive formulations. By creating new interdisciplinary academic programs, and developing close collaborations with colleagues overseas rooted in different national and intellectual cultures, Area Studies scholars press the social science and humanities disciplines in the US to look beyond, even sometimes recast unstated presumptions and easy interpretations.

At times the challenges to the disciplines have often involved sharp intellectual, institutional, and political struggles. Despite, or perhaps because of, its successes, tensions between Area Studies and certain disciplines continue over intellectual issues, economic resources, and the structure of academic programs. The debates over the appropriate content and organization of internationally oriented university-based teaching and research rise and fall, and never quite

seem to be resolved, though over time they do shift ground.

To complicate matters, the individual Area Studies fields are neither internally homogeneous, nor are they similar to each other. Indeed examined up close, they are strikingly distinctive in their political, institutional, and intellectual histories, and in their relationships with the disciplines. This volume then is an effort to illuminate the divergent trajectories, agendas, strengths, and weaknesses of the individual fields in order to provide a concrete sense of their intellectual substance, a framework for defining their contributions, limits, and relations to the core disciplines (themselves changing over time), and a fresh basis for thinking about—even attem-pting to shape—where Area Studies might be headed.

As the nine chapters that follow suggest, "Area Studies" is best understood as a cover term for a family of academic fields and activities joined by a common commitment to: (1) intensive language study; (2) in-depth field research in the local language(s); (3) close attention to local histories, viewpoints, materials, and interpretations; (4) testing, elaborating, critiquing, or developing grounded theory against detailed observation; and (5) multi-disciplinary conversations often crossing the boundaries of the social sciences and humanities. Most Area Studies scholars concentrate their own research and teaching on one or a number of related countries, but generally try to contextualize their efforts in large regions of the world (e.g., Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia), beyond the US and Western Europe. Scholars working on the three one-country Area Studies fields (China, Japan, and Korea), often engage in at least implicit comparisons among them, and often command literatures in languages from two or more of these countries.[2] As the essays will demonstrate, the boundaries of the Area Studies fields—and especially the African, East European, Soviet, and Southeast Asian fields—are historically contingent, pragmatic, and highly contestable. The conventional boundaries have often been intellectually generative, but they clearly have limits as well.

Always controversial for the challenges it poses to the disciplines, recently Area Studies has itself been challenged from various directions as a vestigial remnant of the Cold War, as

politically tainted, as a-theoretical exotica, or as increasingly irrelevant in the face of hegemonic and homogenizing globalization and transnational forces. This volume responds to and rejects these charges by laying out the divergent and productive intellectual and institutional trajectories of the major fields over the last several decades, and many of the most significant debates in and around them. The nine essays that follow—on the African, Chinese, Eastern European, Japanese, Latin American, Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and the Soviet studies fields[3]—are varied in approach and style. The authors were selected for their interest in and knowledge of the intellectual history of their own specific area studies field, and were charged to write freely from their own particular vantage point. As part of the collective enterprise, they all attempt to describe the key issues, contributions, and controversies within their field and its engagements and interactions with the core social science and humanities disciplines. They also deal with their fields' relationships to the private foundations, US government agencies, national and international politics, generational changes, new domestic constituencies, and colleagues and institutions overseas. At the same time, coming from a wide range of disciplines and intellectual perspectives, they vary in their emphases. Read together, and comparatively, they should provide a reasonable sense of the heterogeneity, multiple trajectories, tensions, problems, and productivity of US area studies.

This Introduction summarizes some key issues and conclusions from the essays. It begins with a brief account of their political, intellectual, and institutional roots in US universities. It then turns to both the critiques of Area Studies and the challenges and contributions they have brought to the disciplines, to the universities, and to the structure and generation of knowledge. It closes with some suggestions regarding their future evolution as the various fields engage with social science and humanities scholarship in the US and abroad.

THE ASTONISHING GROWTH OF AREA STUDIES

From the beginning of the Twentieth Century through the Second

World War, internationally-oriented teaching and research in US colleges and universities rarely went beyond European History and Literature, Classics, and Comparative Religion. Up to 1940, US universities had produced no more than 60 PhDs on the contemporary non-western world and most dealt with antiquity.[4] Today, thousands of college and university faculty regularly teach on the history, literature, contemporary affairs, and international relations of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and the former Soviet Union. Freshman seminars on "South Africa Today," large undergraduate lecture courses on the Middle East or Latin America, specialized graduate seminars on "Indonesian Gamelan," or "The Nineteenth Century Indian Novel," are now standard components of contemporary higher education. Topical courses in the social sciences, humanities, and professional schools now use examples, readings, ideas, and case materials from all across the world.

At the same time, US universities and colleges now host over two hundred thousand foreign students every year as well as tens of thousands of visiting scholars from overseas.[5] Vast numbers of students from recent immigrant families are now studying in US colleges and universities and tens of thousands of US students annually study or conduct research overseas. International workshops and conferences, publication programs and journals abound, increasingly facilitated by the new electronic media. Area Studies and internationally oriented courses, research, and collaboration are now central components of higher education in the United States, and many campuses have programs or plans to facilitate their "internationalization."

In general, Area Studies has been institutionalized in US universities in two distinct types of units; (1) Area Studies Departments, and (2) Area Studies Centers, Institutes, or Programs. Area Studies Departments—for example, South Asian Studies at the University of Chicago, Middle East Studies at Princeton University, or East Asian Languages and Literatures at the University of California, Berkeley—usually offer undergraduate degrees combining course work in the language, literature, history, religion, and sometimes the politics of the particular region. While these departments are multi-disciplinary they generally tilt to the

humanities. At the graduate level, Area Studies Departments tend to concentrate on literature and history. In the 1940s and 1950s, when Area Studies were just starting to take root in US universities, these departments were considered crucial to training area specialists. However, during the 1960s, and clearly by the 1970s, the overwhelming majority of MA and PhD students specializing on the non-Western world were being trained in, and then hired to teach in, the core social science and humanities departments; anthropology, art history, geography, history, language and literature, music, sociology, political science, etc.[6] One result is that nearly all Area Studies faculty have at least double identities, e.g., as an historian and as a China scholar, as a sociologist but also as a Latin Americanist. Institutionally, this has meant that Area Studies departments have often shrunk and become increasingly marginalized and embattled. They continue to produce small numbers of MAs and PhDs, but provide many fewer employment opportunities in the university and beyond than internationally oriented degrees in the social science and humanities disciplines. As a result many Area Studies departments—the hope and key means for developing Area Studies in the 1940s and 1950s—were by the 1980s and 1990s, struggling to maintain their students and status within their universities.

In contrast, Area Studies Centers, Institutes, and Programs have been institutionally far more successful. US universities now house hundreds of these units dealing with every region and all the major countries of the world. These Centers and Institutes may sponsor a few courses, but they do not usually grant degrees. However, they draw in and on faculty and graduate students from all across the social sciences, humanities, and professional schools by organizing or supporting multi-disciplinary lecture series, workshops, conferences, research and curriculum development projects, advanced language and topical courses, publication and library collection programs, and a wide variety of public outreach activities. By these various means, they often become active intellectual and programmatic focal points for both new and established scholars concerned with a particular area of the world.

Despite this dramatic growth of area and other international studies in US colleges and universities debates continue on whether there is enough international and foreign language content in the curriculum; whether it is the right content; how it should be related to undergraduate majors or advanced degree programs. In recent years there has been growing attention to the role and interests of diasporic populations in the student body; the appropriate relationships to current concerns for diversity and "multiculturalism;" and the teaching of foreign languages beyond the traditional French, Spanish, German, and Italian. Equally debated, both in universities and in funding agencies, are the most valued topics, theories, intellectual perspectives, and methods for faculty and graduate student research.

Even if still a debated domain, the extraordinary growth and worldwide coverage of Area Studies scholarship and teaching in the US has no equivalent elsewhere in the world. Paris and London have gathered numerous intellectuals from other parts of the globe, and many European universities have, or have had, comparable centers or programs but they are mostly focused on their colonial or ex-colonial possessions. Likewise, Japanese and Australian universities have active research and training centers concerned with their immediate neighbors in East and Southeast Asia, but they support relatively little scholarship on more distant regions, such as the Middle East, Africa, or Latin America. Elsewhere in the world only a few universities have sizeable programs or centers that go beyond their own region—and the study of the US or North America. Only the US has numerous universities with multiple Area Studies Centers, Institutes, and Programs dealing simultaneously with several regions of the world. Overlapping and competitive, they jointly provide global coverage.

How did this dramatic internationalization of US higher education come about? What prompted or provoked it? How has it been organized and what effects has it had on the overall shape and activities of the US university?

As suggested above and as documented by the essays that follow, prior to the Second World War American universities had only a few

scattered faculty who taught or conducted research on the non-Western world. Shortly before the War small numbers of scholars of Latin America and of the Soviet Union began to encourage more coordinated research on their respective regions. During the War, many of the few US specialists on other regions of the world—mostly at Ivy League universities—became intelligence analysts in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and helped train officers for overseas commands and postwar occupation forces. Post War, some initiated careers in the several new US government security and intelligence agencies. Most returned to university life.

For the vast majority of Americans at the time, Western Europe was the only familiar area of the world beyond the US.[7] Most Americans had studied something of Europe in secondary school, some had traveled there, and many had recently fought there. Likewise, nearly all the faculty and students in US colleges and universities came from families of European background. European institutions, politics, economies, cultures, and social formations were at least somewhat familiar from the media and they were often similar or even sources for their US counterparts. Thus although the US was helping to rebuild Europe with Marshall Plan aid, increasing US academic expertise on Europe did not seem of the highest priority.

In contrast, US ignorance of the rest of the world was striking. At the same time, both liberal and conservative elites in US universities and foundations perceived direct challenges and threats from the Soviet Union, China, the emerging Cold War, but also in the passions and prospects of decolonization in Africa and Asia. In the this context, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations and the Carnegie Endowment convened a series of meetings producing a broad consensus that the US had to increase sharply its ability to understand and act effectively in previously unfamiliar nations and societies all across the globe.[8] To this end, the US seemed to need internationally oriented economists and political scientists able to construct programs that would encourage capitalist development, "modernization," and democracy both to achieve social and political stability and to secure US interests.

Although many presumed that the adoption of US institutions

and procedures in other countries would bring about their rapid development, at least some academics and foundation staff were aware that the largely American and Euro-centric forms of knowledge and experience of most US economists and political scientists might not be adequate for understanding or acting effectively in the non-Western world. They argued that the direct application of Western models, examples, and techniques in societies of very different character and history might not work at all, and that more culturally and historically contextualized knowledge of the nations of Africa, Asia, Central Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East would be essential if the US was to assist their economic development, modernization, and political stability—as well as to compete effectively for their loyalty with the Soviet Union.[9] From their perspective, the US would need not just economists and political scientists, but also other social scientists as well as humanists who focused on the basic structures and dynamics of these societies; their social organization, demography, social psychology, cultural and moral values, aesthetics, religious traditions, cosmologies and philosophies, etc. Indeed, such knowledge would be useful not just for policy analysts, diplomats, and development specialists, but in business, the media, primary and secondary education, and the foundations. And it seemed especially needed in higher education where it could be generated, mobilized, directed towards overseas projects, but also broadly disseminated to wider populations.

The lead to develop these capacities was taken by a set of major US research universities; Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Wisconsin, and Yale. In various ways, and with varying foci, each began to make large long-term investments in faculty, student fellowships, foreign language facilities and courses, libraries, research funding, etc. A small Fulbright overseas teaching and exchange program had begun in 1946. But in 1950, The Ford Foundation established the prestigious Foreign Area Fellowship Program (FAFP), the first large-scale national competition in support of Area Studies training in the US. The initial FAFP awards provided two years of inter-disciplinary and language training on a selected country or region of the world, plus two years of

funding for in-depth overseas dissertation research and write-up. The FAFP made its first awards in 1951, and by 1972 had supported training and research in nearly every corner of the accessible world of some 2,050 doctoral students in the social sciences and humanities. In 1972, the Ford Foundation turned over the FAFP to the interdisciplinary (humanities and social sciences) Area Studies Committees jointly sponsored by Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). Over the next 30 years, and primarily with continuing Ford Foundation support, the two Councils funded approximately nearly another 3,000 area studies dissertation fellowships, and with funds from other foundations as well, another 2,800 postdoctoral area studies research grants. The Ford Foundation also provided the joint area studies committees of the two Councils several million dollars for the field development workshops, conferences, and publication programs.[10] During this same period, the foundation also provided $120 million in grants directly to some 15 major US research universities to establish interdisciplinary Area Studies Centers. Altogether, between 1951 and 1966, the Ford Foundation invested more than $270 million in Area Studies training, research, and related programs.[11]

Although it built on earlier initiatives, and other funders joined in along the way, The Ford Foundation was the single most important force and source of external funding for the institutionalization of multi-disciplinary Area Studies as a core component of higher education in the US. Other large and important programs followed. Precipitated by Sputnik, the variously , amended National Defense Education Act of 1957 established the Department of Education's program that now partially funds the primarily administrative, language teaching and public service (outreach) costs of some 125 university-based Area Studies units as National Resource Centers. The Fulbright Program for "Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange," was much expanded in 1961, ultimately funding 1000s of dissertation and postdoctoral research and teaching projects in selected countries around the world. Likewise, the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities developed national competitions to fund international research

projects, workshops, conferences, exchanges, and related activities. Private foundations (e.g. Mellon, Henry Luce, Tinker), have also provided major support for Area Studies programs dealing with particular countries or regions of the world, while still others (e.g., The Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the John D. and Katherine T. MacArthur Foundation), both funded and have drawn on numerous Area Studies scholars for their own topically focused international programs. But it was the long term commitment and massive support of training and scholarship by the Ford Foundation at key research universities, and through the SSRC/ACLS joint area committees, that established Area Studies as a powerful and academically legitimate approach to generating knowledge about the non-Western world. Still today, the Foundation continues to play a major role in funding the continuing evolution of Area Studies, now in a very different international context.[12]

Clearly, Cold War concerns, and a view of US elites that the country would need to play a vastly expanded international role in the second half of the century were the major impetus in founding and funding US Area Studies in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The CIA and other government intelligence and security agencies often tried to draw on academics and to shape research agendas—with few known successes, and some spectacular failures.[13] However, as documented in the essays that follow, within a very few years the scholars in the universities and SSRC/ACLS area studies committees re-captured the initiative with broader academic agendas specifically including the humanities, history, and other fields far from immediate political concerns. As Bonnell and Breslauer demonstrate in their essay, even the Soviet field, dealing with the Cold War enemy, expanded in these directions. And while this led Reuben Frodin, a key Ford Foundation official, to exclaim repeatedly, "not another study of Pushkin?!" he fought to keep Ford Foundation funds flowing to Area Studies programs all across the country.

Indeed, from the 1960s onwards, many Area Studies scholars were publicly and passionately critical of the US government's definition of "the national interest," and its policies and actions in the region of the world they were studying. This was most dramatically evident in

the Southeast Asia field during the Vietnam War—though the war in fact triggered intellectual and political dissent all across the area studies fields. At the same time, numerous Latin Americanists—often personally and intellectually close to their counterparts in Latin America—were becoming publicly and deeply critical of US policies towards Cuba, the Caribbean, and Latin America. Likewise, large numbers of South Asia scholars vigorously protested the US government's "tilt towards Pakistan" during the Indo-Pakistan conflict of 1965. As Bonnell and Breslauer, and Walder demonstrate, even the Soviet and China Studies fields quickly came to include many scholars sharply critical of US policies towards those "enemy" countries. And numerous Area Studies scholars and organizations attacked US government sponsored "development" and "modernization" programs in the Third World as variously ill-conceived, unworkable, counter-productive (if not simply counter-insurgency), self-serving, elite oriented, and of limited value to the poor of the countries they were claiming to aid.

In effect, while international political considerations were at the root of the initial investments in Area Studies in the 1940s and 1950s, charges that Area Studies have simply been a function of or handmaiden to US Cold War concerns, have been grossly inaccurate for at least the last 40 years. Clearly, some scholars stayed close to the initial political concerns and continue to use US lenses and models to interpret other regions of the world. However, as the essays in this volume demonstrate, all of the Area Studies fields quickly broadened and took on much more varied and distinctive intellectual and research agendas, debates, and trajectories. By the mid-1970s they were sharply differentiated from each other. For example, as John R. Bowen points out in his essay, US research on Southeast Asia began with heavy emphasis on political issues and the social sciences but has since become heavily "cultural" (though still not humanistic) in orientation. In Latin American Studies, as Paul W. Drake and Lisa Hilbank illustrate, a variety of political economy frameworks have spiraled through the field over the past four decades—heavily influencing Political Science, Sociology, and theories of development generally, far beyond Latin America. As Victoria Bonnell and George Breslauer emphasize in their essay, the key debates in the Soviet Studies field since the late 1960s turned around whether the USSR

could evolve towards more "rational" socio-political forms, or would necessarily degenerate. Pearl T. Robinson's essay on African Studies points to the sharply conflicting definitions of Africa and consequently divergent research agendas among African-American scholars, mainstream (white) Africanists, and their counterparts in African universities. In contrast, the South Asia field in the US was initially built on 19th century European humanistic studies of Sanskrit and South Asian religion and philosophy. In the past 25 years however, as Nicholas B. Dirks points out, the intellectual life of the field has been re-directed if not dominated by the "Subaltern" movement and broader epistemological debate over the position of the scholar and appropriate categories and subjects for the study of post-colonial societies.

As these abbreviated examples begin to suggest, and the essays that follow elaborate, multiple factors account for the dispersion of intellectual interests and trajectories among the various Area Studies fields. These include:

- the evolving political relations of the US to the countries in question
- the changing interests of public and private funders
- the academic disciplines and personal and political commitments of the academics in each field
- the shifting mix of disciplines, and thus of methods and debates, that have dominated research in the field
- evolving relations, debates, and collaborations with scholars within the country or region of study
- the age of the field (that is, newly invented in the US, or building on literature from within the region, or by European colonial scholars)
- the difficulty of learning the languages of the region
- dramatic events or conflicts (revolutions, wars, insurgencies) within the area
- the intellectual and political demands of populations from the region residing in the US
- ease of access for field, archival, or collaborative research

Given all these dimensions along which the Area Studies fields vary, and have varied still more over time, it is not surprising that the fields now have highly distinctive characters and have diverged in very different directions.

But the development of Area Studies in US universities has meant more than simply the addition of new research agendas or idiosyncratic scholarly communities in US universities. Thanks to their diverse disciplinary bases and the continuing evolution of the fields, Area Studies scholars have been developing and legitimating new understandings and forms of knowledge which their Euro-centric or Americanist colleagues in the social sciences and humanities are not likely to have imagined. By generating new data, new concepts, new approaches to key issues, and new units of analysis, by legitimating the intrinsic and analytic value of the perspectives of the "native" or the "other," as well as more culturally rooted interpretations and explanations, and by creating new types of multi-disciplinary academic units, they have intellectually and politically challenged, and even in varying degrees transformed, US universities and the social science and humanities disciplines.

As Immanuel Wallerstein et al. have pointed out in "Open the Social Sciences," (1996), the current disciplinary division of labor in the social sciences was established in the last decades of the 19th century. At that time, drawing on European models, American universities established the major social science departments for research and teaching to match the then current understandings and categorizations of the world. Economics was to deal with the Market, Government (later, Political Science) with the State, Sociology with Society, Psychology with the Individual, History with the Past, and Anthropology with "the Other." The Humanities were likewise divided into distinct Departments of English, the literatures of various other languages (French, German, Italian, etc.), Philosophy, Classics, Religion, Art History, Music, etc. Each of these departments, and real world domains, and disciplines were perceived as essentially well-bounded unitary wholes that could appropriately and usefully be studied independently from the others. A domain in the world, an academic department, and an intellectual discipline

were perceived as mutually defining. Equated with, and legitimating each other, they became the fundamental building blocks of US universities.

Either individually or clustered in Schools or Colleges within a university, departments compete for resources from the central administrations. However, at least in the major research universities, it has long been the disciplinary departments that have made the primary decisions to hire and fire, give tenure and promote, set research agendas and curricula, determined what is useful and valuable knowledge, and what and where to publish. Over time, each discipline has developed its own distinctive agendas, concepts, curricula, jargon, research methods, internal debates, subfields and specializations, standards of evidence, journals, national organizations, and intellectual and institutional hierarchies. In this context, cross-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary training and research have long been at best looked on askance, and often denigrated. At the same time, as early as the 1920s there was a growing recognition that the rigid 19th century compartmentalization of the world still reflected in these disciplinary *cum* departmental structures no longer fit current understandings of how societies and cultures actually operate. Not only were increasingly sharp divisions and specializations within departments reducing their integrity and coherence, but numerous scholars were pointing out that the market, polity, society, culture, etc.—the domains that justified the 19th century division of academic labor and departmental and disciplinary boundaries—all penetrate, interact, and shape each other and cannot be studied in isolation. For at least the last 30 years, scholars have often been seeking out intellectual colleagues in other departments, and there are now constant pleas and proposals for greater interdisciplinarity. Institutionally, however, despite—or perhaps because of—these critiques of their constrained intellectual foundations, the walls between the disciplines have only become higher and more difficult. Given the power to hire and recommend or deny tenure, buttressed by exclusionary discourses or jargons, and in competition with each other for the resources of the university, most social science departments

have become, if anything, more sharply bounded. Indeed, Timothy Mitchell argues in his essay that follows that the resulting tensions and contradictions, and the critiques they engender, have created a "crisis in the disciplines" far more problematic than the debates surrounding Area Studies.

In effect, the core social science and humanities departments can be thought of as a set of vertical columns forming the core of the US university, linked at the top by administrators who have risen through this departmental structure but now charged to oversee the institution as a whole. Internally, departments may be increasingly fragmented, with individual faculty often finding more common cause and intellectual companionship with scholars in other disciplines entirely. But the organizational and political response has been overwhelmingly defensive; using increasingly heavy bindings to fend off reorganization and keep the department intact.[14]

By calling for multi-disciplinary approaches and a variety of research methods to understand non-Western societies or cultures, area studies scholars, communities, and funders were arguing that new forms of knowledge call for new structures of knowledge generation. In doing so, they directly challenged the disciplinary departments' insistence on maintaining their preferred and limited methods, traditional intellectual and organizational boundaries, their stylized narratives of "the West," their frequent "universalization" of Western experience, and the vertical organization of the US university.[15] The efforts in the 1950s to create Area Studies departments defined *ab initio* as multi-disciplinary seemed a way to avoid this conflict; they were attempts to slip the multi-disciplinary Area Studies approach into a traditional departmental structure. But without a conventional disciplinary framework, Area Studies departments have been subject to disparagement and attack from other faculty and administrators. Subtly or overtly, Area Studies departments frequently were (and other later multi-disciplinary departments often still are) denigrated as deriving from external, "more political" agendas, and thus less intellectually legitimate and lower status in the university community. Trying to be both multi-disciplinary and

departmental—challenging the traditional notion that a department equated with a discipline—was more than the older elements of the university would easily tolerate.

In contrast, Area Studies Centers, which made no claim to being departments or disciplines, but instead were structured and understood as venues for cross-disciplinary discussion, debate, programs, and projects, were much less of a threat. They fit more readily into the culture and structures of the university, and have been far more accepted and successful.[16] In this context, Area Studies units are not about to replace the disciplines, no less attain institutional equivalency. At least for the moment—and short of an unlikely intellectual and institutional revolution and the reconstruction of the social science and humanities departments along some unimagined new lines—Area Studies needs these disciplines for the concepts and methods they can contribute to understanding and translating another society or culture. At the same time, the disciplines need Area Studies to continually challenge their US- or Euro-centric assumptions and for the construction of alternative social and cultural processes and understandings. As the essays that follow indicate, Area Studies and the disciplines have historically stood and continue to stand in productive tension with each other.

Beyond these structural considerations, Area Studies has also paved the way for many other multi-disciplinary academic movements. By demonstrating that there are intellectually, politically, and socially important forms of knowledge, and legitimate modes of generating knowledge that require interdisciplinary collaboration which the traditional disciplines are unlikely to produce on their own, Area Studies has laid the institutional basis for the subsequent establishment of Women's Studies, Gender Studies, African-American Studies, Ethnic Studies, Asian-American Studies, Cultural Studies, Agrarian Studies, and numerous other interdisciplinary centers, and programs since the 1970s. Indeed, there are now growing efforts and calls to draw on Area Studies models in order to counter "American exceptionalism," to "internationalize" American Studies, and to set research on the US into comparative contexts.[17] The core disciplines are still central to

the university and are maintaining their institutional and intellectual power; Area Studies and the other multi-disciplinary enterprises are not leading to the dissolution of the disciplines. However, they now function as a countervailing force in US universities, a set of venues for cross-disciplinary conversations increasingly recognized as essential for understanding the mutually constitutive elements of any society.

THE CRITIQUES OF AREA STUDIES

Despite the relative success of Area Studies Centers in legitimating intellectual and organizational innovations in the US university, Area Studies continue to be critiqued by scholars who define themselves solely or largely in terms of a disciplinary affiliation. Strikingly, attitudes towards Area Studies and the frequency and severity of the critiques vary with the discipline or sub-field they come from. Economists were key actors in Area Studies in the early decades when modernization theory and development economics were at their peak. But now having been captured by quantitative techniques and formal modeling—and more recently by the presumed power of so-called free markets to dissolve or render superfluous other cultural, historical, and institutional influences—few US economists, and certainly no mainstream departments, pay any attention to Area Studies at all. The data from the non-Western world is rarely adequate for their quantitative models, and particular locations can hardly matter when universal and convergent processes are presumed to be at work. In contrast, scholars in Political Science, attempting to adopt the rational actor and formal modeling of Economics, have been the most active source of criticism, followed by some more positivistic elements of Sociology.[18] On the other hand, anthropologists, historians, and linguists representing disciplines in which contextualization is fundamental, manifest fewer qualms about Area Studies. In the Humanities, Cultural and Postmodern Studies, though on different grounds that will be described below, have turned out to be a more productive source of critiques of Area Studies. Ironically, the academics most resistant to Area Studies are often unselfconscious area studies specialists themselves—their "area" being

the United States. By focusing on the US and treating it as a natural unit of analysis, thus making the US the universal measure for other societies, and not subject to the international scrutiny, comparisons, or contextualizations which Area Studies scholars conducting research in other areas of the world cannot avoid. These various critiques of non-US Area Studies are sometimes contradictory and may be aggressive or defensive. But because they are sufficiently common, institutionally powerful, and in some cases intellectually serious, they do need to be addressed. Four major themes have been sounded.

First, as noted earlier, various scholars have charged that Area Studies was simply a political movement, essentially an effort to "know the enemy," and a function of the United States' effort to win the Cold War. In that light, although perhaps useful for understanding and dealing with the Communist world and the threats it posed up to 1991, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, they argue Area Studies is now obsolete. This critique is most frequently heard from within Political Science, the discipline most excited by rational choice theories and most directly engaged with the political rivalries of the Cold War, its termination, and the transitions that have followed. But another version is heard from the scholars on the left opposed to US foreign policy and international activities who view Area Studies as a component of and support to US hegemony, and as opposed to progressive change elsewhere in the world. We have already suggested that such narrow political views and representations are grossly inaccurate; they will be deconstructed in detail in the essays that follow. In fact, as the essays on Chinese, East European, and Soviet Studies all point out, the fields were already highly diversified during the Cold War. With its termination in 1991, access to scholars, archives, field studies, and collaboration, research agendas have expanded further to include post-socialist transitions, civil society, ethnic resurgence, cultural change, etc.

Second, and somewhat in contradiction, others in the positivist tradition have charged Area Studies with being merely "ideographic," primarily concerned with description, as opposed to the "nomothetic" or the theory building and generalizing character

of the core social science disciplines. At its worst, this dismisses Area Studies as simply generating exotica, which, however intrinsically interesting, cannot add up to a convincing or more broadly useful theory or narrative. At best, this view sees Area Studies as a source of data and information, fodder for useful and more universal theories by scholars in the disciplines with broader visions, more sophisticated techniques, and greater intellectual skills. Again, this critique is largely heard from academics committed to rational choice theories and the formal modeling of social and political processes.

As the essays that follow demonstrate, however, there is no reason to believe that Area Studies research has been any less systematic or theory-driven—or, indeed, has contributed less to the refinement or development of new theory—than social science and humanistic research on the US and Western Europe. Perhaps quite the contrary. It is certainly true that few scholars anywhere ever propose grand new theoretical statements and proofs. Most, more modestly, see themselves as analyzing an interesting issue or topic, in the process testing, critiquing, confirming, or marginally elaborating or refining, some larger (possibly theoretical) generalizations. This is equally true of scholars writing on the politics of Bangkok or the politics of Washington DC, on Russian novels or US novels. More fundamentally, all social and cultural research is inevitably rooted in some kind of theory or theories, however explicit or implicit, intended to make sense of significant relationships among selected but intensely examined elements of a society, a poem, a history or religious movement, etc. As Drake and Hilbink underscore in their essay on Latin American Studies, data collection and theory development are inextricably intertwined and inter-active.[19] Without a reasonably coherent theoretical structure or narrative in mind—that is, parts fitting together in some plausible logic—a researcher would not know what to look for, how to interpret it, or how to write it up as a publishable article, essay, or book.

The issue, then, is not the presence or absence of theory, but what kinds of theory are being used, and how explicit or implicit, ambitious or modest, scholars are in articulating their theoretical assumptions and concerns. Here, of course, there is vast room for

variation and debate as theories come and go, attract attention, are tried out against diverse data, materials, and concerns, and are then rejected, refined, celebrated, or absorbed into disciplinary (or common) knowledge. As the essays on Africa, Latin America, South Asia, and the Soviet field in this volume document, not only have the Area Studies fields been thick with theory and theoretical debates, but they have also regularly generated theoretical developments and debates within the disciplines as well. In fact this should not be surprising, for as previously noted, the vast majority of Area Studies scholars are located in the core social science and humanities departments. Privileging (or worse, universalizing) theory derived from accounts or analysis of US experience or phenomena alone overlooks the fact that the US is, although "unmarked" by US scholars who work on it, as much a contingent, historically shaped and particular, if not peculiar, "area" as China, or India, or Latin America. Indeed, on many dimensions, the US is probably one of the more unusual and least "representative" societies in the world—and thus a particularly problematic case from which to build generalizing theory. In addition, Area Studies scholars working on societies and cultures outside the US usually recognize, at least implicitly (and often explicitly), both the comparative value and the limits of their research arenas. In contrast, US scholars working on similar issues at home often seem to treat the US as the "natural" society, theorize, universalize, and advise others freely, and see no bounds to their findings. A classic, and perhaps most egregious case would be the 1994 claim by Shepsle and Weingast that the study of the US Congress provides the template for understanding comparative politics and the political systems of other parts of the world, ignoring differences in institutional forms, norms, values, histories, and the contexts they might exhibit.[20]

A third and more subtle set of critiques of Area Studies scholars argues that they have absorbed and have continued to use uncritically the politically biased categories, perspectives, commitments, and theories of their colonialist scholar-administrator predecessors—or indeed, of contemporary US or Western leaders attempting to maintain or expand hegemonic control over the rest of

the world. The claim, dramatically put forward by Edward Said (1987), and echoed across Subaltern and Cultural Studies generally, is that despite Area Studies scholars' evident personal interest and specialized knowledge of the area of the world they are studying, the conceptualization of their projects, their research agendas, and what they have taken as appropriate units of analysis and relevant models of society and social change, have been fundamentally and consistently US- or Euro-centric.

In effect, there are two different charges here. One is that Area Studies scholars have sometimes or often failed to study other societies in their own terms, as social and cultural life and processes are experienced and might be construed, constructed, analyzed, and critiqued from the inside. The second is that they have failed to extract themselves from their conscious or unconscious political biases and therefore have not adequately framed their analyses in some purportedly more universal theory, whether neo-liberal, neo-Marxist, post-modern, etc. Instead, Area Studies scholars are accused of—at best, naively, at worst, intentionally—imposing their own personal and/or national agendas and variously idealized or mythologized formulations of the historical experience of "the West," both to explain, and most often in the process, to denigrate, other societies that have almost always been in one way of another, politically and economically subordinated.

There is certainly some truth to these charges. As Michel Foucault has repeatedly reminded us, political power and position and the generation of knowledge are inevitably entwined. Area Studies, however, has no monopoly on this. As Alan Tansman and Timothy Mitchell in this volume stress, it is true of essentially all social science and humanistic research, whether conducted by insiders or outsiders. All scholars in the US or elsewhere, including the critics of Area Studies, are influenced by their political context and political commitments. The imposition of politically freighted categories and theories is unavoidable and always shapes how issues are framed, what kinds of questions are raised, what equally valid questions are ignored, and who benefits from the research. Choosing the interesting question, which elements to emphasize, how to balance them, and

how to decide which is more important, will always be a matter of judgement based on the values and interests of the observer. (Indeed, as Timothy Mitchell notes in his essay, for many years the Middle East Studies Association would not allow panels on Arab-Israeli relations because no one could be expected to "be objective" about the issues.) But this is equally true for the insider, or the outsider looking in; power and perspective will always shape the generation of social knowledge.

Given, however, the current economic and political hegemony of the US as the world's sole "superpower," the research assumptions, concepts, procedures and funding of US scholars, often seem overbearing or irresistible. They also often provoke deep cultural and political resentments (and sometimes alternative analytic formulations) in other parts of the world. Nevertheless, Area Studies scholars have perhaps one advantage in dealing with this problem. Intensive, research conducted outside of one's home country, in a setting which in various ways is unfamiliar, is at least somewhat more conducive to disruptive self-consciousness about these issues than research conducted in the familiar and seemingly "natural" US. And a self-conscious attempt to articulate as clearly as possible the commitments, perspectives, and power relations one brings to one's research, is perhaps the best that any scholar can do.

A fourth critique of Area Studies derives from the current fascination with "globalization." Although there is huge debate on how to define it, how new it really is, and how to study it, globalization, in one form or another (as financial, population, media, or cultural flows, as networks, "deterritorialization," etc.), is broadly seen as erasing boundaries, and forcing the homogenization of localities, cultures, and social and economic practices. From this viewpoint, an Area Studies focus on the residual and presumably diminishing specificities or unique dynamics of particular localities, is seen as beside the point; an outdated concern for a world that no longer exists, or at best, that is rapidly fading away.

In fact, globalization, however defined, when closely examined in particular places is rarely a homogenizing force or erasing all other social or cultural forms and processes. Not only is globalization

producing increased disparities in power and wealth—both nodes of rapid accumulation and large zones of exploitation and poverty—but its particular manifestations are always mediated and shaped by local histories, structures, and dynamics. Likewise, the recent growth and virulence of divisive ethnic movements, identity politics, fundamentalisms, and now terrorist networks as well, often seem both a consequence of, and a reaction to, elements of globalization. Growing concern with these phenomena is certainly increasing the number of Area Studies projects examining the complex interaction of global and local economic, political, and cultural forces. But while the specifics vary place to place, this approach to globalization only makes the intensive multidisciplinary and broadly contextualized analysis of particular locations and areas—the hallmark of Area Studies—even more essential.

But still more dramatic changes in the conceptualization, procedures, and to some extent, the programmatic organization, of Area Studies are now resulting from increased recognition of the importance of processes of transnationalism, as an element of globalization. At its origins in the 1950s, the geographic regions into which the Area Studies world was divided—South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, etc.—were conventional, politically inspired, and in culture-historical terms sometimes quite arbitrary and always debatable. (Is Afghanistan part of South Asia, the Middle East, or Central Asia? Why should the study of Africa be divided between the Sub-Saharan countries and those of North Africa? What common features unite Burma and the Philippines as parts of Southeast Asia? Should the Baltic nations be included in Europe, or Eastern (or Central) Europe, or the Former Soviet Union? Is Eurasia a meaningful unit?) With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the bi-polar world, several of these conventional categorizations are now deeply questioned and old boundaries are being redrawn. Still more to the point, recent attention to a variety of transnational diasporas and networks is emphasizing the importance of new social and cultural formations cross cutting previous nation-state and area boundaries. Al-Qaeda, as a transnational terrorist network, is almost too obvious to mention. Of deeper history, the millions of Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis now scattered all across the globe and interacting simultaneously with their new host countries and their original homelands in complex and deeply significant ways have

made it increasingly implausible to study South Asia, or the individual countries within that region, as bounded geo-political communities. Likewise, African-Americans, and many residents of the Caribbean are now engaged with Africa in ways that are reshaping the cultures and politics of their current homelands. And despite the US Border Patrol, Mexico, Central America, California, and Texas are increasingly becoming an integrated social and economic region. In another way, recognition is growing that England, France, Portugal, and the Netherlands as past metropoles of world-spanning empires, have been—and continue to be—deeply shaped by their ex-colonial activities and subjects. The reality and analytic value of the old geo-political Area Studies units has not completely disappeared. But many boundaries have become much more permeable, and the importance of sometimes new, sometimes longstanding, transnational social, economic, and cultural formations and networks are increasingly being recognized, studied, and becoming the basis for new institutional support and organizational arrangements.

One immediate response to the questioning of the traditional boundaries of the Area Studies fields was to suggest that more comparative and thematic research across areas should be encouraged to, among other things, help determine exactly how different and/or interconnected the areas really are. With this in mind, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) in 1986 established the Committee on the Comparative Study of Muslim Societies to focus attention on the variations and continuities across Islamic world, stretching from Southeast Asia, South and Central Asia, to the Middle East, Africa, Europe and the United States. In 1994 the SSRC developed a new Mellon Foundation-funded Dissertation Fellowship Program giving priority to cross-area comparative research seeking broad generalizations and cross-culturally robust theory. This sort of comparative research is clearly valuable and likely to grow, constrained though it is by the need to learn at least two languages, two histories, and two cultures, the contextualizing features and processes essential to make sense of comparative cases. Unfortunately, not many scholars at the dissertation stage (or beyond) are able to manage this with ease.

SOME FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The new geo-politics and the softening of national and area boundaries are already being reflected in the new attention population diasporas. Once one could comfortably study Southeast Asia, or countries within it, e.g., the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, as relatively bounded units. Today, there is growing recognition of the value—indeed the necessity—of studying the flows of people from such areas, or the countries within them, as they spread around the world. The analytic reasons are several; diasporized populations have numerous feedback effects on the dynamics of their homelands. They may drain off educational investments, alter the age structure, and reduce population and sometimes political pressures. But diasporas also send back remittances, and political ideas, sometimes provide new investments or entrepreneurial skills, and can reshape, even globalize the world views, opportunities, and networks of those remaining at home. Diasporized populations also often affect the political and diplomatic relations between their host country and original homeland. German relations with Turkey, US relations with Cuba, Chinese relations with Indonesia, etc., are all affected by the migrant populations from those countries. In addition, viewed in the new setting of a host country, immigrant communities may reveal previously unremarked elements of their homeland society and culture—or of the host society and culture. Thus a previously unnoticed strain of racism in Swedish society is now evident thanks to the presence of African and Middle East populations in that country.[21] In the US, the children of historic and current diasporas constitute increasingly large proportions of college and university students. As such they are demanding new kinds of courses, not just on the language, culture, and history of their ex-homeland, but also on their own diaspora, as well as critical courses on their homeland's relationship to the United States. Likewise, the growing numbers of scholars from other regions of the world—especially South Asia—now teaching in US universities have generated a vast array of new intellectual approaches, theories, and interpretive schemes.

More broadly, the expanding attention of Area Studies scholars to

diasporas and transnational populations is raising questions about and recontextualizing the prior focus on the nation-state as the primary actor and ultimate natural unit of international analysis. The nation-state was clearly one of the great social inventions of the 19th century and over the last 150 years it has spread across the globe as the seemingly natural macro-political unit for organizing societies and inter-state relations. Yet public and scholarly interest in the development and character of nation-states has tended to draw attention away from other powerful world shaping macro institutions and processes ranging from the numerous diasporas now coming into focus, to the rapid transmission of cultural forms, to the multiple forms of global capitalism, to the various world-girdling political and social institutions and movements ranging from transnational NGOs and the United Nations and its international conventions, to the Bretton Woods institutions, to the environmental, feminist, and peace movements. These alternative macro-foci to the nation-state vary in strength, salience, and manifestations in different world areas, but are all in one way or another challenging traditional nation-state and area boundaries. Their significance, however, can only be understood by close analysis of particular manifestations and processes in diverse parts of the world, the classic role of Area Studies scholarship.

Area Studies' particular leverage for the study of global and transnational phenomena has forced a new recognition of the necessity of serious and ethical collaboration with scholars elsewhere in the world. Well trained Area Studies scholars, as outsiders, may discern significant elements of a society or culture that insiders tend to take for granted. But as outsiders they will still inevitably miss some key internal understandings and dynamics. Scholars and intellectuals rooted in those cultures will have different research agendas, perspectives, experiences, and priorities than their US counterparts and can answer questions, redirect or reframe straying analyses, and open unanticipated doors and domains that the most well trained area scholar might not even imagine existed. To usefully translate these key elements back to US audiences almost always requires the active assistance of insiders.

Russian scholars are now working with US, European, and other counterparts to clarify the multiple transitions their society is going through. The theoretical generativity of Latin America studies, a field long marked by high levels of collaboration, only underscores this point. And humanists in other regions of the world who command the local languages, literatures, philosophies, and cosmologies are now especially well placed to challenge and redirect Western formulations and presumptions. More broadly still, the future evolution of social theory will almost certainly derive from efforts to take into account social experience and understandings in a much wider variety of societies than has been the case up to now.

There is also a more fundamental reason value to cross-national collaboration. More reflexively, collaborators abroad enable US scholars to begin to see the particularities and limitations of their own society, agendas, perspectives, and theories. Collaboration and complementarity, the insider's view and the outsider's, joined together, can provide a much fuller and more analytically rich and useful account of other societies and our own, than either view alone. Unfortunately, while this may be easy to assert in principal, it is often difficult to achieve in the current global context. As Timothy Mitchell points out in his essay, we now live in a world increasingly dominated, economically, politically, culturally, and militarily by "a new US Imperium." European social theorists (Bourdieu, Foucault, Giddens, Gramsci, Habermas, Hall, etc.) and South Asian and other "Subalterns" continue to provide important new perspectives and intellectual frameworks, but US scholars and universities nevertheless shape much world-wide academic (and public policy) discourse. US views tend to define the key questions, approaches, and methods, and US universities train large numbers of scholars from all over the world, socializing them into the particular assumptions and perspectives of the US disciplines. As Andrew Walder points out in his essay this has facilitated joint projects with Chinese sociologists trained in the US, but it has also reduced the salience in social and cultural analyses of perspectives, understandings, and issues emerging from Chinese experience. Genuinely collaborative relationships, drawing equally on multiple national perspectives, will be

increasingly important if US scholars are not simply going to read into other societies the presumptions of their own. Given continuing imbalances in political and economic power, institutional strength, and research funding between the US and most other societies, such balanced relationships are often difficult to construct.

In general, although Area Studies in the United States as an institutionalized form of generating new knowledge may have started from relatively narrow view of US "national interest," the character and intellectual agendas of the individual Area Studies fields have diverged dramatically over the past 50 years. While the end of the Cold War in some quarters reduced the seeming significance and support Area Studies and its concern for understanding the internal dynamics of other societies, 9/11 has selectively re-stimulated support for the study of "less commonly taught" languages (e.g., Arabic), and parts of the world (e.g., Central Asia), once thought exotic and irrelevant to US national interests. However, the context has changed dramatically since the 1940s and 1950s, and the beginning of the Cold War. Large, diverse, and critical Area Studies communities are now in place, and while additional support for international training and research is usually (though not always) welcomed[22], scholars in these fields today are even less likely to be swayed in their research and teaching by short term government agendas. Instead, individually and collectively, the Area Studies fields and the scholars who constitute them continue to focus on de-parochializing the humanities and social sciences. At the same time, they continue to contribute to the diversity and flexibility of the US university, to innovative approaches to the generation of social theory, to at least rough translations and greater knowledge of other societies and cultures, and in the best of cases, to a new basis for deeper comparative understandings of US society and culture as well.

David L. Szanton worked for many years at the Ford Foundation and the Social Science Research Council before coming to the University of California at Berkeley where he served as the Executive Director of International and Area Studies. He received his Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Chicago.

Notes

1. Robert B. Hall, Area Studies: With Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences, 1947.

2. Scholars with any historical interest in Japan and Korea must read Chinese. Likewise, serious scholars of China must be able to read the vast literature on that country in Japanese.

3. Several of the smaller area studies fields (Canada, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific) have been left out of the volume, because the contributions they have made and the issues they face are reasonably similar to those of the larger fields that are addressed. It was also a pragmatic matter of leaving sufficient room in a single volume for adequate discussion of the larger and more influential fields.

Western European Area Studies has also been omitted from this volume because it is of a very different character than the other Area Studies fields. West European experience, and West Europe scholars, languages, and literatures have historically been central subjects in US universities and intellectual life generally. Vast numbers of US scholars have written and taught about England, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Scandinavia, etc.; their cultures, histories, and institutions are at the core of our own, and are even taught in US primary and secondary schools. Western Europe is therefore vastly more familiar, and has a very different status in our educational system and lives than Area Studies fields dealing with the more distant societies and cultures discussed in this volume.

4. Thomas Bender, "International Studies in the United States: the Twentieth Century." International Rectors Conference, New York University, February 22, 1997.

5. Open Doors, Institute of International Education, 1999.

6. At the University of California, Berkeley, for example, since 1946, over 90 percent of the advanced degrees dealing with Southeast Asia were granted from the core disciplines or professional schools. Across the country, however, Psychology was always absent, and Economics has now essentially stopped producing area specialists. Through the early 1970s small numbers of economists working on Third World development issues counted themselves, and were often regarded as, area specialists. But as the problems of Third World development turned out to be more intractable than imagined in the years following the Second World War and decolonization, and as Economics has increasingly moved towards quantitative analyses and formal modelling, the sub-field of development economics has lost status in the discipline, and very few US economists now claim to be, train others to be, or indeed, engage intellectually or programmatically with area studies scholars.

In contrast, very few psychologists ever became involved in area studies. The discipline seems content to derive universal psychological principles largely from the study of US high school students and college sophomores.

7. In 1949, the SSRC sponsored a meeting of all the people in US universities, government, foundations, the professions, and journalism with and expertise on any country in South Asia and Southeast Asia. Altogether, only 50 such people could be found. [citation].

8. Hall, Area Studies.

9. In his Western Economists and Eastern Societies: Agents of Change in South Asia, 1950–1970 (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985)] George Rosen provides a fascinating and compelling account of the agonies and failures of MIT and Harvard economists attempting to suggest or impose decontextualized economic development strategies in India and Pakistan during the 1950s and early 1960s.

10. The eleven joint committees of the two Councils and their year of formation are as follows: Slavic 1948, Latin American Studies 1959, Near and Middle East Studies 1951, Contemporary China 1959, African Studies 1960, Japanese Studies 1967, Korean Studies 1967, Eastern Europe 1971, South Asia 1975, Western Europe 1975, Southeast Asia 1976. They were all terminated in 1997, and replaced by Regional Advisory Panels for essentially those same areas.

11. Beresford in Volkman, Ford Foundation, 1999.

12. 1997 $25 million Crossing Borders initiative.

13. E.g., the 1964–65 Project Camelot, the 1967 Advanced Research Projects Administration (ARPA) Thailand Study Group.

14. There have of course been exceptions. An early brief success, and then total failure, was Harvard's Department of Social Relations formed in the 1950s by faculty from Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology, and disbanded in the 1970s. Likewise, the University of California at Santa Cruz attempted to forgo disciplinary departments and organize instead around themes or issues, but that too only lasted a brief while before the disciplinary structures reemerged as dominant. At the University of California, Berkeley, the Life Sciences managed to reconfigure, integrate, and collapse ("decant" was term of art) 37 departments and units into 17 new units which made intellectual sense. However, it took them five years of debate and the promise of substantial new facilities to achieve that goal; there seem no comparable prospects for the social sciences and humanities.

15. Indeed, the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Cornell was explicitly intended by its founder, Lauriston Sharp, to become a model for subverting the departmental structure of the university. [Personal communication 1978].

16. In founding the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Cornell University in 1950, Lauriston Sharp quite explicitly hoped to create a model that would be the basis for radically reorienting Cornell into a set of multidisciplinary topically focused units. He obviously did not succeed, but Cornell did develop many such centers and programs earlier than most other US universities.

17. Thomas Bender, "An Institute on Internationalizing the Study of American History" 1996; Desmond and Dominguez, "Resituating American Studies in a Critical Internationalism," American Quarterly, vol. 48, no. 3, 1996.

18. These have been largely, though not entirely, Americanists. Political Scientists and Sociologists who have had to learn Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Eastern European languages, and even Spanish, in order to conduct their research have been much more supportive of Area Studies approaches.

19. Donald Stokes (1997) makes a similar point in insisting on the mutual dependence or dialectical relationship of basic and applied research.

20. American Political Science Association Comparative Politics Newsletter, 1994.

21. Allan Pred, Even in Sweden, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

22. There has been huge debate in the Area Studies communities and associations around the National Security Education Program because of its close connections with US intelligence agencies.