

News of the Profession

Prepared by ROBERT I. CRANE

Asian Studies in the Soviet Union

(Report contributed by Professor Rodger Swearingen, University of Southern California)

Until the death of Stalin ushered in a new era of East-West relations, relatively little was known, scarcely anything was written, on the status and development of Soviet training and research in the Asian field. This past summer the author had the opportunity to visit the principal centers of Asian training and research in Leningrad and Moscow and to talk at length with a number of leading Soviet specialists in the area of Asian languages, politics, modern history, economics, and culture. It was also possible to work at the Soviet Union's two largest libraries, the Leningrad Public Library and the Lenin Library in Moscow, and to visit specialized Oriental collections.

The results—incomplete as they are—of this intensive period of study and discussion, combined with earlier research, may provide something of an over-all view of Asian studies in the Soviet Union, and may be a stimulus for further study and exchange. Notes and comments will be summarized under four general topical headings: (1) Training—Leningrad University and the Institute of Oriental Languages of Moscow University; (2) Research—the Academy of Sciences' Oriental Institute and the new Institute of Chinese Studies of the Academy of Sciences; (3) Library resources—the Leningrad Public Library, the Lenin Library in Moscow, and the specialized Oriental collections; and (4) Soviet specialists and recent publications on Asia.¹

Before considering each of these topics, it may be appropriate to record several general observations and impressions relative to the Asian studies field in the U.S.S.R.

¹ This report was begun several years ago. It was completed when a grant from the Ford Foundation permitted me to spend the summer of 1957 studying at and visiting centers of Russian and Far Eastern studies throughout Europe and to spend one month in the Soviet Union. May I record my appreciation to the Ford Foundation and to the University of Southern California. I am also indebted to a number of colleagues for reading the manuscript and for making invaluable suggestions. Among them, I should like to mention especially William Ballis, Peter Berton, David Dallin, Paul Langer, James Morley, Philip Mosely, David Munford, Nicholas Poppe, Robert Rupen, George Taylor, Colonel Geoffrey Wheeler, and Allen Whiting. Appropriate portions of the manuscript were also sent the principal Soviet institutions under discussion with a request that specialists there, whom I had met during the summer, make corrections and additions on personnel, library resources, etc. Helpful replies were received to four of five letters sent, two from Leningrad University, one from the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow, and one from the Institute of Oriental Languages at Moscow University.

The first and most striking impression one receives is the intensive, accelerated pace at which Soviet institutions and individual scholars are pursuing the study of modern and contemporary Asia. To be sure, Russia has a long tradition of "Eastern" studies, but linguistics, history, the Middle East, and Central Asia have tended in the past to dominate the scene. A reorganization of the Academy of Sciences' Oriental Institute in 1950 may be taken as the formal point of departure for a reorientation of the field along several lines: (1) a shift of the center of Oriental studies from Leningrad to Moscow; (2) a change from a concentration on linguistics and history to greater concern with modern languages and the contemporary scene, including the beginnings of area study programs in the universities and (3) an intensification of academic interest in the Far East, South, and Southeast Asia. An article in *Kommunist* of 1955 speaks of the need for the further development of "Eastern" studies in the Soviet Union, singling out especially as "underdeveloped areas" India and Southeast Asia but asking the Soviet scholar also to "expose those features of the development and nature of the forces underlying the people's revolution in China, Mongolia, Korea, and Vietnam. The development of Soviet orientalism," the article warns, "still does not correspond to the demands upon it." As late as 1956, Soviet officials apparently regarded the problem as critical and unresolved. Speaking to the point, Anastas Mikoyan asked the Twentieth Party Congress: "But whom do we have, after all, to engage in a serious study of these questions? . . . The Academy of Sciences does have an institute that studies the problems of the East, but all that can be said of it is that although in our day the whole East has awakened, that institute is still dozing." Since then, the Soviets have produced an increasing number of publications on modern Asia and have established two new institutes of Oriental studies: one, at the University of Moscow for training in modern Oriental languages and area studies; the other, a research institute for the study of modern China, as part of the Academy of Sciences.²

A second point worth noting about Asian studies in the Soviet Union is the fact that training and research are confined to relatively few centers with Moscow and Leningrad Universities and the Academy of Sciences dominating the scene, although it now appears that Tashkent may be emerging as a third major center. This is especially true of Far Eastern studies. To keep the picture in focus, however, several qualifications must be added: work on the Middle East and on Central Asia and the Soviet Far East is going on in Kazan, Kyzyl, Alma Ata, Baku, Ulan Bator, Ulan Ude, and Vladivostok, as well as in a few other universities. Significant research on Asia also takes place from time to time at the various specialized institutes such as the Institute of History, the Institute of Economics, the Institute of Ethnography, etc. Further, it must be assumed that considerable work on Asia of a classified nature is underway in the Foreign Ministry, the Red Army, and within the other security agencies. Recent Indian experience with Soviet technical personnel who appeared in India with a

² The prewar background of Asian studies in the Soviet Union is sketched in James Morley's note, "Some Important Soviet Organizations and Periodicals Devoted to the Modern History of Asia," *JAS*, XVI (Aug. 1957), 673-677.

knowledge of one or more of the Indian languages is a case in point. This does not, however, alter the general proposition that compared with the United States, Asian studies (particularly Far Eastern studies) in the Soviet Union are highly centralized at a very few large institutions.

A third point has to do with certain important effects on Asian studies of recent political changes in the Soviet Union. In the field of Oriental studies, as in so many other areas, the "thaw" has allowed Soviet scholars to re-establish continuity with earlier Russian efforts. The history of Russian Oriental studies receives considerable attention, and the scholars of the Tsarist and early Soviet periods are once more getting their due, with extensive republication of their works as well as the appearance of new books and studies such as two volumes of *Ocherki po istorii russkogo vostokovedeniia* (*Articles on the History of Russian Oriental Studies*). Biographies of early Russian explorers and scholars are being published. Purged scholars, long unmentioned, now get full credit for their work. The catalog at the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies includes many older items obviously just recently "cleared" for general use (that is, many new catalog-cards for older items by scholars such as Poppe). Along these same lines, numerous articles and even books are being published which list holdings of various libraries and archives, not only in Moscow and Leningrad, but also at Kazan and other places. Classics like Rashid-ad-din, Marco Polo, Piano Carpini, etc. are being republished and are attracting renewed attention. Perhaps even more significant, during the past several years a number of Soviet Orientalists began appearing at conferences in Western Europe and they have begun to correspond with their counterparts in Europe, Asia, and the United States. Moreover, there is evidence of a gradual change in general policy in Soviet library procurement and cataloging in the direction of accommodating a wider range of sources with unorthodox viewpoints.

A fourth point worth recording relates to the unevenness of library or research resources, both the personal libraries of the specialists and the major library collections. The point is doubly interesting because it is not clear that the unevenness stems exclusively from ideological considerations. In certain cases, in critical areas or on sensitive issues, materials probably have been deliberately excluded from the general collection. Western holdings on Asia of the principal libraries are conspicuously stronger for the period since 1953. That virtually none of the standard U. S. works on China, Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia for the years 1946 through 1952 are listed as opposed to the inclusion of a rather considerable number of more recent American publications on Asia suggests that Soviet libraries have partaken, however unsatisfactorily, of the celebrated post-Stalin relaxation. It may be noted further that the article in *Kommunist*, referred to above, on the need for "modernizing" and "developing" Soviet Asian studies directs: "The Soviet Orientalist must also be familiar with the latest achievements not only of other Soviet specialists but of foreign scholars as well." A close look at the Lenin Library's over-all holdings on the Far East, nevertheless, leaves one with the impression that the Soviet Union's largest library is still behind the times.

A fifth point concerns geographic or area emphasis. Based on three criteria—

size of research and training staffs, number of students enrolled in language and area classes, and volume of publications—current Soviet priority on training and research on the modern “East” (which includes Africa) appears to be as follows. China clearly has top priority with a major training and research effort under way. Next comes India, also now under intensive study, followed by Japan and Korea. Central Asia and Mongolia probably rank next, though if work on their languages and linguistics were the sole criterion, both of these areas would certainly rate a high position in the scale. At about the same level of development are modern Middle Eastern studies, where a new area program augments substantial earlier linguistic, ethnological, and historical work. Two areas appear to be developing very rapidly from almost nothing two years ago: Africa and Indonesia. Finally, we come to Indochina, Tibet, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and the Philippines which—at least on the academic side—seem to be about as poorly represented in the Soviet Union as they are in the United States.

TRAINING—LENINGRAD AND MOSCOW UNIVERSITIES

Asian studies in the Soviet Union—that is, training programs in languages, literature, history, and, more recently, area studies—are concentrated in the Oriental Faculty of the University of Leningrad and at the newly established Institute of Oriental Languages of the University of Moscow.

Oriental Faculty, University of Leningrad.

The Oriental Faculty of the University of Leningrad is devoted almost exclusively to the language and literature and historical aspects of Asian studies. Present enrollment for all classes in the Oriental and African languages and literatures is roughly as follows: Chinese, 20; Korean, 20; Japanese, 15; Mongolian, 10; Indian, Tibetan, and Indonesian, 25; Arabic, 10; Persian, 10; African, 10. In addition to at least one Russian professor in most of the divisions, the university has sought to secure the services of a native instructor for each of the languages. Thus, for example, a Japanese who came to Leningrad several years ago from Sakhalin, where he worked in Soviet radio broadcasting, now assists the professor of Japanese. Similarly, a Chinese professor from Peking joined the faculty three years ago, while two years ago an Indonesian instructor accompanied by his wife and four children arrived at the University to launch the program of Indonesian studies. Of the several languages noted above, the African languages appear to be the only area handled without the assistance of a native from the area.

Courses are also offered in Chinese and Japanese history and in the histories of the Middle East and ancient Orient. Enrollment is not large. Twelve students are currently majoring in Chinese history; fewer than that are enrolled as majors in Japanese history. Topics of fifth-year theses in Chinese history completed at Leningrad University during 1956 and 1957 may be taken as indicative of the M.A. level research work: “Critics of the Views of Hu Shih,” “The Diary of Lin Tse-hsu as an Historical Document,” “Peoples’ Movements in the

1860's," "Contemporary Chinese Historical Scientists Writing on the Battle of Concessions," and "Soviet-Chinese Relations—the 1950 Agreement." In the Japanese field, also at Leningrad University, three fifth-year thesis topics for this academic year are: "Sixteenth-Century Peasant Revolutions," "The Satsuma Rebellion," and "The Meiji Restoration."

The nature and scope of the language and literature study may be illustrated by the Japanese program at the University of Leningrad, which I was able to examine in some detail. It is a five-year program conceived and presented throughout in two aspects: theory and laboratory (that is, practice). Briefly, the curriculum and approach for each year are as follows:

The first year introduces the students to the field, taking up the theory of languages, linguistic systems, the history of the Japanese language, systematic presentation of grammar, morphology, and syntax, brief consideration of the history of the study of Japanese in the U.S.S.R., Europe, and Japan (the U. S. was not mentioned and perhaps is not considered worthwhile), and bibliography. The "laboratory work," that is, practical study of the language itself, during the first year involves: (a) study of grammar and simple texts, (b) the mastering of 800 characters, (c) practice in Japanese conversation with a native Japanese informant. Classroom work during the first year consists of 12 hours per week for a total of 408 contact hours, divided as follows: introduction and grammar, 68 hours; text study, 136 hours; conversation, 136 hours; writing practice, 68 hours. A comprehensive examination at the end of the first year covers the whole complex of the "introductory course."

The second year is devoted to the language of literature and "literary speech." The best examples of modern Japanese literature are studied in chronological order "to show the growth of the literary language." History, style, morphology, and syntax are taken up as "theory," while in the laboratory, the student now turns his attention to: Tsubouchi Shōyō, Futabatei Shimei, Ozaki Kōyō, Natsume Sōseki, Shimazaki Tōson, Kunikida Doppo, Yamada Bimyō, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, Tokutomi Roka, Tayama Katai, Izumi Kyōka, Nagai Kafū, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, Arishima Takeo, Mushakōji Saneatsu, Kobayashi Takiji, Hosoi Wakizō, Tokunaga Sunao, Takakura Teru. The last four are "proletarian authors" who seem to occupy the same exalted place in Japanese literature in the Soviet Union that Howard Fast for years occupied in the American literature scene there. The classroom schedule of contact hours is identical to that of the first year. A comprehensive examination concludes the second year's work.

The third year is divided between "contemporary literary Japanese" and "classical Japanese": 240 hours each, still on a 12 hours per week schedule. Students are introduced to the "public language," both spoken and written. Newspapers, journals, contemporary short stories, and novels form the core of this work. Simultaneously, the student plunges into "old literary" or classical Japanese along with *kambun*, which continues to the end of the fifth year. This section of the program is organized as follows: (1) the classical language of the eighth through twelfth centuries, including: (a) the conversational language of the time, and (b) Chinese as the language of official correspondence

and of scientific and historical literature; (2) medieval literary Japanese of the twelfth through sixteenth centuries, consisting of three parts: (a) remnants of the old literary language which still persists in archaic form in literature, (b) medieval conversational language which also may be found in its archaic forms, and (c) Chinese which, as in the preceding era, continues as the official language; (3) literary Japanese of the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries devoted to the four main topics: (a) remnants of "old literary" Japanese which existed as a language of scholars of that period, (b) the developed form of medieval Japanese which had become the national language of the period, (c) the conversational and written language of literature, and (d) Chinese, the language of knowledge and philosophy.

The following texts are read in whole or part during the third year: *Kojiki*, *Man'yōshū*, *Taketori monogatari*, *Kokinshū*, *Genji monogatari*, *Tosa nikki*, *Makura no sōshi Konjaku monogatari*, *Heike monogatari*, *Hōjōki*, *Tsurezuregusa*, *Taiheiki*, *yōkyoku* (*Sumidagawa*, *Ataka*, *Fujito*), *kyōgen*, *Tsukubashū*.

The fourth year is essentially a continuation of the third, and is likewise divided between "contemporary literary" and classical Japanese. A total of 480 contact hours are scheduled, 12 regular hours per week plus 160 for special courses and seminars, the latter including *kambun*. Sixteen classroom hours per week are now demanded of the students. Among the literary figures the students encounter during the fourth year are: Saikaku, Chikamatsu, Ueda Akinari, Jippensha Ikku, Shikitei Samba, Bashō, and Buson. The texts of contemporary juridical literature are also read towards the end of the eighth semester. An examination concludes the year.

The fifth and final year is divided among four main subjects: (1) classical Japanese, (2) history of language and writing, (3) dialectology, and (4) seminar on special problems. The study of classical language follows the pattern of the fourth year. The course on the history of the language and writing seems particularly thoroughgoing, embodying all aspects from general syntax development and the lexicography and phonetics of the urban language, to a detailed examination of the development of the writing systems in China and Japan.

Because more attention appears to be paid to the study of Japanese dialects in the Soviet universities than is usual in the American programs, it may be worth noting this aspect in greater detail. The fifth year course includes: (1) the history of Japanese dialects, (2) study of a dialectological map of Japan, (3) the dialects of Japan proper (Kyushu—Oita, Miyazaki, Fukuoka, Nagasaki, Kumamoto, Saga, and Kagoshima; Honshu—Kansai, inner Honshu), (4) dialects of Miyako Island, (5) brief description of some other local dialects, and (6) methodology of dialectological research. An examination at the end of the fifth year covers the four main subjects above and concludes the program.

It is difficult to assess the level and competence of the graduates. Students of both Japanese and Chinese with whom I talked seemed quite at home in the spoken language. The very intensity of the program and the seriousness with which it is undertaken—given a carefully selected, small group of students—should assure a reasonably high level of linguistic attainment. Leaving aside

limitations imposed by the ideology, the weakness of the program appears to rest rather in the early over-specialization and inadequate attention to general background and training in history and in the other social sciences as well as the inaccessibility of many of the significant Western works on modern Asia. If language teaching or linguistic research is the expectation of the fifteen students currently enrolled in the program, these shortcomings may not be significant. If graduates are to be utilized for training, research, or analysis in the history or social science fields, the problem takes on another dimension.

Institute of Oriental Languages, University of Moscow.

The Institute of Oriental Languages, the other major training center on the Far East, was established in 1956 within Moscow University by combining the Oriental elements of the faculties and programs of the historical and philological departments. Its task, according to its director, appears broader than its name would imply: "To prepare people to work in the fields of language, history, literature, and economics of the East." The program is a six-year sequence with the main focus on language and literature but with the student also required to specialize in one of the several disciplines. In a sense the approach approximates the area study program in the United States. The emphasis is on the spoken language. The "plan" calls for forty students per year to be enrolled in the six-year program. A new building to house the Institute is scheduled for completion within two years. In its second year, the Institute currently has eighty students, in addition to a number of students transferred to senior status from other faculties.

The majority of the students are specializing on China and India. The departments of the Institute, represented by the Institute staff as from greatest to least importance are: China, India, Arabia, Indonesia, Japan, Turkey, Iran, Vietnam, and Korea. As at Leningrad University, a native speaker is available to almost every department. Students are encouraged to live in dormitories with foreign students in order to practice their languages. Although only in its second year of operation, the Institute has already dispatched a number of students for training abroad. Among those mentioned during the course of conversations with members of the Institute—but not thought to represent the complete picture—are seventeen students in China, several students in India ("not at universities, but working there"), a few students in Korea. The faculty expressed the hope that soon it would be possible to send students to Indonesia, Vietnam, and Japan. A number of Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Indonesian students are already enrolled at Moscow University.

The program of study runs as follows: the first year is divided between intensive language study and several of the content courses (history, geography, economics, history of thought, law, general history, etc.). The second year is largely a continuation of the first, but the student is now asked to write a term paper. One second-year student chose to write on Marco Polo's description of the people of China. During the third year, which is devoted in part to literary papers (the poetry of Li Po was mentioned as a typical topic), the students will be required to select a second Eastern language. For those specializing

on Japan or Korea, the second language would automatically be Chinese. Students are also either encouraged or required (the point could not be clarified) to study "the appropriate Western language" throughout the six-year program. This appears to mean English for China, Japan, and India; and French for Vietnam. During the fourth year, philology and lexicology will be introduced as well as advanced grammar and syntax. A projected fourth-year term paper is more comprehensive. A hypothetical example given by one of the Institute faculty: "The Economic Development of China during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century." During the first part of the fifth year the students will be required to polish up their knowledge of the language and customs of their chosen area, since the middle of the fifth to the middle of the six year is set aside for study abroad. The student will be expected to go to the foreign area with the topic of his thesis in mind, perhaps even with the exploratory work completed. After a year in one of the designated foreign areas, he will return to finish up his thesis during the last period of his work at the Institute.

The Institute expects to publish papers and reports from time to time. These should be available upon request to interested specialists in the United States.³

RESEARCH—INSTITUTES OF THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Apart from some individual research on the part of the university professor and the unpublished work of the graduate student, Soviet research in the Asian and particularly in the Far Eastern field is largely concentrated in three Institutes: (1) the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences located in Moscow, (2) the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences, and (3) the new Institute of Chinese Studies of the Academy of Sciences. It should be added that even individual research and significant theses are usually published under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences.

Mention must also be made of specialized work at several other locations. Apart from scattered research on Asia at the various institutes (Institutes of History, Economics, etc.), Middle Eastern and Central Asian studies are strongly pursued outside of the Oriental Institutes of Moscow and Leningrad. On Central Asia and the Soviet Far East relevant work is going on in many places, as mentioned earlier. Russian field expeditions of various kinds are active throughout the inner Asian frontier: a leading Soviet geographer recently went to Sinkiang to take part in a Chinese expedition there; Russians and Mongols are scheduled to cooperate on new archaeological excavations at Erdeni Dzu in 1960; the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences has been extensively publishing results of various Siberian expeditions, including considerable material on Buriat Mongolia. Russian, Mongol, and Chinese scholars are said to be working together on a three-volume history of Mongolia.⁴ No less active or diversified is the field of Middle Eastern studies, which is by no means confined to

³ A statement on the organization and tasks of the Institute of Oriental Languages is found on pp. 196-197 in No. 1 (1956) of "Historical Philological Series" of *Vestnik* of Moscow University.

⁴ See the report by Robert A. Rupen on pp. 537-541 of this Number.

Oriental institutes. The Russians have a strong tradition of Middle Eastern interests: a whole school of Arabists has been trained; Egypt has been studied exhaustively; much work is being done on Turkey. Throughout the border regions from Tashkent to Baku interest in the Middle East has been manifest. Tbilisi has recently been mentioned as a center of Semitic studies. To this must—as in all cases—be added the secret programs, particularly training of technical personnel for political and economic work in the Middle East and in Southern Asia.

The Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences, Moscow.

The Institute of Oriental Studies (Institut Vostokovedeniia) was reorganized and greatly expanded in 1950 by amalgamating several existing organizations: the Institute of Pacific Studies in Moscow, the Institute of Oriental Studies of Leningrad, and the Moscow Branch of the Leningrad Oriental Institute. This represented not only a formal merger, but, as one of the directors of the Institute put it: “a certain shift in direction towards the modernization and intensification of Eastern studies in the Soviet Union.”

The Institute of Oriental Studies was originally formed in Leningrad in 1930 by combining resources and personnel of the Asiatic Museum, the Institute of Buddhist Culture, the Turkological Office, and certain other individuals and groups. After several reorganizations, the Institute came to function after 1938 under the Branch of Literature and Languages of the Academy of Sciences though its actual tasks also included the study of the history, politics, economics, and culture of Asia as well as a wide range of collection, translation, and publication activity.

There is no question that the Institute today represents the principal Soviet center of research on Asia. Training appears to be involved in its operations only incidentally: certain staff members participate in the educational programs of universities and training institutes; research undertaken by the graduate students of the Institute does, of course, serve to increase their research competence.

The Institute staff in six years has grown from about 100 members at the time of its reorganization to its present level of 400 regular members and 100 graduate students. Institute research is currently organized into five major departments: (1) the Far East with some 50 senior specialists, divided by area as follows—Japan, 25; Mongolia, 12; Korea, 12; (2) India divided along disciplinary lines—history, 12; economics, 10; philology, 8; (3) Southeast Asia divided into Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines, with altogether perhaps 15 or 20 specialists; (4) Africa, a new department established only in 1956, where “few scholars have yet become available”; (5) Middle and Near East also operating, I was told, “with a very small number of researchers despite the large area to be covered.” In addition, plans have been drawn to set up a sixth section for international relations which will have the task of coordinating or investigating problems which cannot be approached regionally such as United Nations affairs, international law, etc.

Some of the staff members maintain offices in the Institute building and library in the center of Moscow. Others apparently prefer to work at their own university or other government offices in Moscow, while still others fall into the category of associate members, long-distance commuters and correspondents, at times with major responsibilities elsewhere in the Soviet Union. The Institute was characterized by one of its officials as "the only institute of Oriental studies in the Soviet Union." The precise relationship to the Institute of specialist personnel in the outlying areas where no Oriental institute exists is not clear.

Publications of the Institute include several important journals on Eastern studies, a series of "Notes" put out by each of the departments, and Institute-sponsored publications, ranging from full-length research studies, through short political handbooks or manuals, to substantial abstracts of dissertations in the Eastern field. (Titles of principal Institute journals are listed on page 536.)

The Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences.

The Leningrad Branch of the Oriental Institute differs from the now parent Moscow institution in two ways: it is very much smaller, having only about 50 staff members, and the staff is composed almost exclusively of historians concerned with the earlier periods of history. Work of the Institute is organized as follows: (with the number of research specialists for each area indicated) (a) Far East—China, 10; Japan, 3; Korea, 4; Tibet, 1; (b) South and Central Asia—India, 3; Persia, 3; Kurdistan, 1; Central Asia, 5 or 6; (c) Arabia, 5 or 6; (d) the Ancient East, 3; (e) Mongolia, 3.

Library resources available to the Institute include the Western and Russian language materials of the Leningrad Public Library, which are not impressive despite the fact that the library claiming some 18,000,000 library units (which includes article titles, listed separately) is the second largest in the Soviet Union, and a 600,000 volume institute Library boasting substantial materials in various Far Eastern languages. Also in Leningrad is a specialized library, established in 1952 and known as the Library (or Department) on the non-Soviet East. (See research and library resources below.)

The Institute of Chinese Studies of the Academy of Sciences.

A new Institute of Chinese Studies (Institut Kitaevdeniia) was set up in Moscow in November 1956 by detaching and expanding the Chinese Department of the Oriental Institute. According to one of the Institute administrators: "China is of great interest to us because the systems are identical and we are very glad to learn from China." The Institute now has about eighty specialists whose task is "to study all things bearing on modern China." Institute work is organized into six main divisions or sections: (1) History, (2) Economics, (3) Literature and Culture, (4) Modern State Structure, (5) Languages, and (6) Publications.

The History section with some twenty staff members is currently engaged

in producing a series of general history outlines. "Later on," the head of the History section stated, "we will attempt some more detailed and profound studies." A history of modern China, 1919–57, is scheduled for publication this year. Two other works are planned: a history of ancient China and a history of China during the "middle period."

The Economics section with twelve staff members, mostly young specialists just beginning their productive period, concentrates on the period of the Chinese Peoples' Republic. Four central themes occupy the economists: (a) industrialization, (b) the economy of agrarian China, (c) reconstruction of the Chinese village, and (d) the question of private industry and trade.

The Literature and Culture section of the Institute has eight staff members, five working on Chinese literature, two studying the problems of Chinese culture (not clearly defined), and one Chinese staff member who assists with difficult translations and otherwise serves as a sort of "trouble-shooter."

The section of the Institute devoted to the modern state structure and politics of China has eight specialists, all historians. The section was only recently established and hence, the section head noted, "is still in the process of working out its research plans." Initial emphasis will be on the period since 1949. Among the topics mentioned as falling within the section's research competence are: law, Party organization and activity (probably including factions, purges, etc.), the united front, ideological struggles against the Rightist elements, and the Chinese courts.

The Language section of the Institute concerns itself with three principal language areas: Chinese (mainly Kuo-yu), Tibetan, and dialects of the Northwest. The principal work occupying the fifteen staff members is a four-volume Chinese-Russian dictionary, the first volume of which is scheduled for publication in 1958.

The Publications section with eight staff members has two chief tasks: (1) the study and translation of ancient manuscripts, such as translations of Chung-tzu, Ssu-ma Ch'ien, etc., and (2) the translation of modern Chinese books of significance in order to make them available for Soviet readers.

One of the major undertakings of the Institute is a multi-volume work—a joint undertaking with the Chinese Academy of Sciences—a documentary on Russian-Chinese relations. The first volume, on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is scheduled for publication in 1959. One cannot escape the impression that the Soviets have now launched a major effort to learn more about the great neighbor to the East.⁵

LIBRARY AND RESEARCH RESOURCES

Soviet library and research resources concerning Asia may be divided into three groups: (1) the Leningrad Public Library and the Lenin Library in Moscow; (2) the specialized oriental collections, including those maintained by the several research institutes; and (3) the personal collections of individual scholars.

⁵ The "Organization of Soviet Institute of Chinese Studies and Its Tasks," translated by Ivan Spector from the Russian, appeared in *JAS*, XVI (Aug. 1957), 677–678.

The personal libraries of the individual Soviet specialists on the Far East tended to be reference rather than research collections. The libraries of professors appeared to contain the standard dictionaries of Japanese and Chinese as well as a substantial collection of materials in the Japanese and Chinese languages. They seem very weak on Western language materials.

The specialized collections of the several Institutes and libraries of Oriental studies in Moscow, Leningrad, and in the Republics form the core of Soviet research resources on Asia. Among these, the Library at the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies is in a class by itself. Founded on the base provided by the Asiatic Museum, which dates from 1818, the total number of volumes in the collection today perhaps exceeds 600,000. The library has an unusual collection of 70,000 Chinese, Korean, Mongolian, and Arabic manuscripts. The Institute's library in Moscow, created in 1951 as part of the reorganization noted above, claims some 200,000 volumes on the "East," including a substantial collection of Western works not generally available to the nonspecialist. If a distinction between the Leningrad and Moscow collections of the Institute can be made, it is the latter's greater concentration on contemporary problems.

Characteristic of the increasing Soviet concern with modern Asia is the new Library, or Department on the Non-Soviet East (*Zarubezhnyi vostok*), established in Leningrad in 1952. This collection, housed separately from both the Leningrad Public Library and the Library of the Institute of Oriental Studies, contains books largely in foreign languages, the greatest number comprising the Chinese collection. While emphasis is on modern literature, history, politics, and economics, science also has its place. Excluded from the Library's scope of "Eastern" interests, the Chief Librarian explained, are not only the Soviet Far East but also Greece.

Coming to libraries in the Republics, mention must first be made of five collections: (1) the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic in the city of Tashkent, (2) the library and manuscript collection in the city of Yerevan in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, (3) the Academy of Sciences' Oriental Institute collection in the city of Baku, Azerbaidzhan Soviet Socialist Republic, (4) the Oriental Institute collection in the city of Tbilisi in the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, and (5) the collection at Kazan University in the city of Kazan in the Tatar Republic. All of the above libraries appear to be regionally oriented, with a strong emphasis on either Central Asian or Middle Eastern studies. Other libraries to which the Soviets refer in connection with Oriental studies are: the Libraries in Stalinabad, in Ashkhabad, in Alma-Ata, and in Frunze. No mention of Vladivostok was made in either conversations in Russia on library resources or in a checklist of major Oriental collections requested and received subsequently from the staff of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow.

Before considering the Lenin Library as a sort of case study, three other libraries in Moscow and Leningrad with Asian interests should be noted: the State Historical Library (*Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Istoricheskaiia Biblio-*

teka), the All Union State Library of Foreign Literature (Vsesoiuznaia Gosudarstvennaia Biblioteka Inostranoi Literatury) in Moscow, and the Leningrad Public Library (Gosudarstvennaia Publichnaia Biblioteka Imeni Saltykova-Shchedrina).

With respect to the specialized collections of Asian language materials, especially those at the several important Institutes, the Russians have the great advantage of easy access to material in the countries where the Soviet Union controls the area or maintains large technical and educational missions as well as exchange students and professors. China, Central Asia, Korea, and North Vietnam fall into this category. In the case of China, not only do the Soviets maintain a large force of technical and military personnel throughout that country, but the Russian students studying in Peking and elsewhere are apparently encouraged to assemble research materials for the Institute, while official exchange of materials between the Soviet and Chinese Academy of Sciences as well as other joint research operations have recently been expanded.

Research resources available to the Soviet Far Eastern specialists of the Academy of Sciences may be illustrated by the library resources of the Academy's new Institute of Chinese Studies. At a meeting with the heads of the several sections of the new Institute, I asked about the main research materials and sources of information upon which the Institute depends. Institute members claimed wide availability of the following sources, in addition to the scholarly publications which are generally available: (1) official Chinese government publications, (2) local government and provincial reports, (3) Chinese newspapers and periodicals, (4) personal observations and field research of Institute staff members in China, (5) Western language materials, (6) Japanese studies of China. In addition, one of the staff members commented: "Because our relations with China are cordial, Soviet scientists have access to 'special Chinese materials'!" Asked whether the Institute also had access to reports of the Soviet technical and economic advisors in China, one of the Institute's economists chose not to answer directly, but implied that such information would, no doubt, become available to the Institute. The Chinese, as we know, have published a number of reports by Soviet advisors in China.

The largest and most significant library in the Soviet Union is the plush Lenin Library in Moscow, which the Soviet academicians regard in the way the American student speaks of the Library of Congress. Boasting a total of more than 19,000,000 library units, its "Eastern" catalog (which includes the Middle East and Africa) comprises forty drawers of cards in Russian and Western languages, about 40,000 titles, including periodicals. About one-third of the total items deal with the Far East. The Library claims some 165,000 items on Asia, including a substantial manuscript collection. With the assistance of several of the Library's staff and two Intourist Guides it was possible to copy and duplicate cards for all Soviet publications on the Far East listed for the years 1955 through the summer of 1957—about 500 items in all. In addition, I examined in detail the nature and scope of the Library's Western-language holdings

in the areas: Far East—General, China, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, Tibet, Sinkiang, Indochina (Vietnam), Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines. The category “Far East—General” produced some surprises. Most English-language materials are divided into five sub-sections: bibliography, general works, culture, new history, and international relations. The sections on bibliography seem particularly weak, containing ten items, mostly very old and obscure titles. Only one standard item is to be found among the dusty, outdated cards: Embree, John, *Southeast Asia: A Selected Bibliography* (1955). The extensive bibliographic work of the Library of Congress is also represented by a single item: *Select List of Books Relating to the Far East* (Washington, 1904). Three familiar volumes appear within the sub-section marked “general works”: Eckel, *The Far East Since 1500* (1947); Hall, *A History of Southeast Asia* (1955); and Latourette, *Short History of the Far East* (1947). That is all. The sub-section marked “culture” includes a single familiar item: Lasker, *Peoples of Southeast Asia* (1945). Under “new history,” a somewhat wider range of material appears: Ball, *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia* (1956); Emerson, *Representative Government in Southeast Asia* (1955); Thompson, *Minority Problems in Southeast Asia* (1955); Emerson, Thompson, and Mills, *Government and Nationalism in Southeast Asia* (1942); Mrs. Lattimore, *Labor Unions in the Far East* (1945); Payne, *The Revolt of Asia* (1947); and Thompson, *Labor Problems in Southeast Asia* (1947). The selection of material in sub-section marked “international relations” proves even more confusing: Battistini, *The United States and Asia* (1955); Hornbeck, *Contemporary Politics of the Far East* (1928); Jones and others, *The Far East, 1942–45* (1955); Lattimore, *The Mongols of Manchuria* (1934); Quigley, *The Far East: An International Survey* (1938); Vinacke, *Far Eastern Politics in the Postwar Period* (1956); Cady, *Roots of French Imperialism* (1954); Farley, *United States Relations with Southeast Asia* (1955); Elsbree, *Japan's Role in Southeast Asian Nationalist Movements, 1940–1945* (1953); Lattimore, *Solution in Asia* (1945); and even Whitney, *MacArthur: His Rendezvous with History* (1956).

I did not attempt to evaluate the material on the language, literature, and history of early China. Materials on nineteenth and early twentieth century China did not seem particularly strong. The drawer on modern China (1927–57) contains some 1,000 titles. Attesting to increasing Soviet interest in the subject, 31 Russian items in the drawer bear dates of 1955 or later. English language material is, however, highly selective and very poorly represented. Of the significant postwar publications on China which have appeared in the United States and Europe, only a single item has found its way into the Lenin Library Catalog: Theodore H. E. Chen, *Chinese Communism and the Proletarian Socialist Revolution* (1955). The rest of the catalog is comprised largely of the older works of Jack Belden, Frederic Vanderbilt Field, Robert Payne, Lawrence Rosinger, and Agnes Smedley.

Japan, on the other hand, presents a different picture, the catalog numbering about 2,000 items. The range of Soviet works on Japanese history is not impressive, although 18 titles bear dates of 1955–57. Among the Western publica-

tions are many of the standard authors: Borton, Brown, Chamberlain, Embree, Latourette, Murdock, Norman, R. K. Reischauer, Quigley and Turner, Sansom, and Wildes. Among the missing are most of the items on postwar Japan, the Occupation, etc., and all material dealing with Left wing in Japan, including, alas, *Red Flag in Japan!* The impressive array of works on Japan published in the United States between the years 1946–53 is totally absent from the collection.

That the several Academy of Sciences research institutes and certain “reliable” senior specialists have access to Western publications other than those available in the Lenin Library collection was suggested by an unusual exchange with one of the directors of the Oriental Institute in Moscow. After discussing the work of the Institute in considerable detail, he changed the subject abruptly to remark, in a slightly humorous vein: “By the way, I’ve read your book (*Red Flag in Japan*, written in collaboration with Paul F. Langer) and I don’t like it!” He then went on to praise the “unique sources utilized” and to comment on the extensive research that he said had obviously gone into the volume. He even asked whether it would be possible for him to obtain some of the basic sources used. “What, then, don’t you like about the book?” I inquired. “Your conclusions!” he replied.

The Lenin Library’s holdings on Korea are weak, numbering a total of about 500 titles. This is perhaps less a criticism of the Library than a commentary on the general level of world interest in the field. Of course, the Korean War sparked a limited world-wide upsurge in research activity on the topic, which trend is also reflected in an increasing volume of Soviet publications on the subject after 1950. Excluding translations and works by Korean authors, some 30 publications by Soviet authors bear a date 1955 or later. Familiar Western materials include: Griffis, *Korea: The Hermit Nation*; Shannon McCune, *Korea’s Heritage*; Kyung Cho Chung, *Korea Tomorrow*; Blair, *Beyond Courage* (London, 1956); Jones, *No Rice for Rebels* (London, 1956); Ridgway, *Memoirs* (1956); Hess, *Battle Hymn* (1956); Joy, *How Communists Negotiate* (1955); and Russ, *The Last Parallel* (1957). In addition, the collection contains a number of U. S. Department of Defense Information and Education publications as well as British Command Papers.

There are about 500 items on the Mongolian People’s Republic, Tibet, and Sinkiang, several hundred on Mongolia, about one hundred for Tibet, and slightly less than that number on Sinkiang. Most of the material is on linguistics or old travel reports and other outdated accounts. Recent Soviet publications on the three areas (since 1954) number 13, 4, and 6 respectively. Standing conspicuously among the file or otherwise old or little-known Western items are Lattimore, *Nationalism and Revolution in Mongolia* (1955) and Norin, *Sinkiang: Gateway to Asia*. No recent Western works on Tibet are in evidence.

Indochina, cataloged as Vietnam, shows approximately 250 items composed of four kinds of material: the Soviet publications, a great many French reports and studies, the Vietminh English output, and a few works published in the United States. In the last category the only familiar item is Fall, *The Vietminh Regime* (1956). Laos and Cambodia show a total of less than 50 cataloged items.

A single Soviet publication bearing the date 1953 appears for Laos, while from the catalog one must conclude that the Soviets have published nothing on Cambodia. The remainder of the file is comprised of old French material, a few English items, and Vietnam news service data (in English). Burma commands a total of not more than 100 items, a very few of them Russian publications. None of the Soviet publications appear from their titles to be substantial studies. Western publications are represented by Furnivall, Hall, and Tinker. Thailand is also poorly represented. No recent Soviet or Western language publications could be located. Fifty items are listed, largely periodical material, much of it from Russian journals. Malaya appears considerably better represented than several of the other areas. While only six Soviet publications are included in the catalog, recent Western material is comparatively rich: British Colonial Office Bibliography (1952); Bartlett, *Report from Malaya* (1955); Carrington, *Malaya and Singapore* (London, 1956); Dartford, *A Short History of Malaya* (1957); The Annual Reports of the Federation; Lockhart, *Return to Malaya* (1945); Purcell, *The Chinese in Modern Malaya* (1957) and *Malaya: Outline of a Colony* (1946); Pye, *Guerrilla Communism in Malaya* (1956); and Robinson, *Transformation in Malaya* (1956). The Philippines, though totaling only about 50 titles, also show a greater selection and wider range of materials than is true for most of the other Far Eastern areas surveyed. Again, Soviet publications are extremely weak, only a single postwar item. Western publications, on the other hand, include: *The Library of Congress Checklist of Philippine Government Documents* (1953); Forbes, *The Philippine Island* (1945); U. S. Department of State background series on the Philippines. U. S. Department of Defense Guide to the Philippines; Romulo, *The Magsaysay Story* (1956); Scaff, *The Philippine Answer to Communism* (1955); Taruc, *Born of the People* (1953); and the *United States Philippine War Damage Commission Reports* (1949). Finally, Indonesia has some 300 title entries but few, if any, substantial Russian items. Apart from some antiquated English and Dutch material, the following Western items are listed: Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice* (1956); Neuman, *Industrial Development in Indonesia* (1955); Wertheim, *Indonesian Society in Transition* (1956); Woodman, *The Republic of Indonesia* (1955); Kroef, *Indonesia in the Modern World* (1954); and Schiller, *The Formation of Federal Indonesia, 1945-1949* (1955).

SOVIET SPECIALISTS AND PUBLICATIONS ON ASIA

Who are some of the Soviet specialists on Asia? What kinds of work are the Russians currently publishing in the Far Eastern field? Both of these questions are too large for any but the most cursory treatment here. However, no article attempting to present a general picture of Asian studies in the Soviet Union would be complete without mention of a few of the Soviet's senior specialists and scholars of Asian studies and without inclusion of a sample or two of recent Soviet publications in the field.

In the sense that the Soviets employ the term "East" or Orient, Soviet specialists on Asia perhaps total upwards of seven hundred. These may be roughly categorized as (1) administrators, heads of Oriental institutes, programs, etc., (2) professors and teachers, (3) senior research specialists, (4) advanced graduate

students, and (5) Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other governmental affairs specialists. The following considerations will be confined to the first four categories.

Selection of individuals and works for inclusion in this brief introduction to Soviet specialists and their interests has been necessarily somewhat arbitrary. It is based primarily upon three criteria: (1) the opinions of their colleagues of senior Soviet specialists in the field such as E. M. Zhukov, the dean of Far Eastern International Relations; P. P. Topekha, Deputy Director of the Academy of Sciences Oriental Institute in Moscow, and the heads of the Japanese and Chinese departments of Moscow and Leningrad University; (2) the volume and character of publications in the field as reflected in the catalogs of the principal Soviet libraries (as defined above) plus additional publications on Asia purchased in Soviet bookstores (some of them not yet cataloged in the libraries), and (3) Soviet journal articles on Far Eastern studies in the Soviet Union and on specific Far Eastern topics. This following material, therefore, is intended to be suggestive rather than definitive or conclusive. On this basis, it may be useful to conclude this treatment by introducing some of these specialists and noting a few very recent characteristic Soviet publications of possible wide interest to non-Soviet students of the field.

In the general field of modern Far Eastern history and international relations, seven names and several publications stand out: E. M. Zhukov, long associated with research on Japan (and China) and now editor of a ten-volume world history, who recently edited *Far Eastern International Relations, 1840-1949* (1956), which is regarded by the Soviets as a standard book in the field; Professor A. L. Narochnitskii, whose work on the colonial policies of the Western powers in the Far East during the latter half of the nineteenth century, has received wide recognition among Soviet scholars; Vladimir Avarin, whose *Struggle in the Pacific Ocean against the Aggression of the U. S. A. and England . . .* was published in 1952; Aleksandr Gal'perin, specialist on diplomatic history, known especially for research on the Anglo-Japanese Alliance; A. M. Dubinskii, who lectures and writes on "The International Relations and Foreign Policies of the U.S.S.R. in the Far East, 1931-1939"; M. Kapitsa for Soviet-Chinese relations, 1931-1945; and V. Popov who wrote *The Failure of U. S. Aggression in China after the Second World War* (1955).

In the China field, mention must first be made of the late Vasili Alekseev, remembered especially for his extensive work on Chinese cultural history. Alekseev died in 1951 in Leningrad. One of the outstanding specialists in Chinese language and literature is N. I. Konrad, who is a prolific writer equally well known for his work on Japan. One of the names in the field of modern Chinese literature is N. T. Fedorenko. Leo Eidlin is another important scholar interested in the general area of Chinese literature. Professor I. M. Oshanin should also be included in connection with a substantial Chinese-Russian dictionary as well as for his work on language reform in China. In the Chinese history field it is difficult to choose from the many specialists. A few better known and representative specialists on Chinese history may be included: Larisa Simonovskaia, who holds the chair of Chinese history at Moscow Uni-

versity, for the history of modern China; G. V. Efimov, who has the same position and interests at Leningrad University; Lazar Duman, who works on ancient China; and V. Nikiforov (*Kuomintang Policy in the Sino-Japanese War*), O. L. Kitsenko (*New History of China*), M. Iur'ev (*The National Revolutionary Army*), K. V. Kukushkin (*Chinese Communist Party History*), N. G. Senin (*Sun Yat-sen*), and G. B. Erenburg (*Revolutionary Movement in China, 1905-1907*). On the geography of China, Ia. N. Guzevatyi deserves mention for his new, short geography of the Chinese Peoples' Republic, along with V. T. Zaichikov, who also published a geography of the Chinese Peoples' Republic last year. The study of political science in the Western sense is not well developed as an academic discipline. This point may be underlined by recalling the fact that the politics and law section of the new Institute of Chinese studies in Moscow is staffed entirely with "historians." Nevertheless, a few names of Soviet specialists in the area of government, politics, and law (including Chinese-Communist matters) may be listed: N. G. Sudarikov and L. D. Voevodin both write on the state structure and political system of the Chinese Peoples' Republic; A. E. Lunev works in the field of Chinese Law, while G. Efimov, V. I. Glunin, I. Loboda, and A. Martynov have all written recently on Chinese Communist Party affairs. China's foreign relations and diplomatic history are of concern to: L. A. Bereznyi (*U. S. Policy in China, 1924-1927*); A. A. Fursenko (*U. S. Open Door Policy in China, 1895-1900*); E. V. Bunakov (Russo-Chinese relations, early nineteenth century). In the field of the economy of China, including the agrarian economy, are: M. V. Fomicheva, who works on the economy of Manchuria, and L. Deliusin, concerned with agrarian reform in Peoples' China. In the related field of the "socialization" of China is G. A. Ganshin ("The Chinese Peoples' Republic on the Road to Socialist Industrialization," 1956). Finally, there are representatives of several other disciplines with recent works on China: S. Bruk in ethnography, B. A. Pankratov on arts and "culture," S. A. Petrushevskii in psychology, V. A. Tokarev in geology, and T. E. Boldyrev and F. G. Krotkov in medicine. Among the university theses completed during the past several years which are on file at the Lenin Library are: "The Creative Application of Marxist-Leninist Theory by the Communist Party of China"; "The Characteristics of Revolution in the Colonies and Semi-colonies During the Period of the General Crisis of the World Capitalist System"; "Agrarian Reform in the Province of Sinkiang of the Chinese Peoples' Republic"; "The Social and Economic Reforms of the Chinese Peoples' Republic, 1949-1953"; "The Establishment of Mutually Equal and Friendly Relations between the U.S.S.R. and China, 1917-1924"; "Soviet-Chinese Relations on the Eve of and in the Years of the Second World War, 1937-1945"; "Soviet-Chinese Treaties: an Expansion of Friendship and Cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese Peoples."⁶

⁶ A bibliography of postwar Soviet works on China compiled by Professor Peter A. Berton will be published during the summer of 1958 as part of the University of Southern California, School of International Relations' Russian and Far Eastern Research Series. Similar bibliographies for Japan, Korea, and Southeast Asia are under preparation as part of the School's growing Soviet-Asian Relations program.

The following specialists on Japan are representative: N. I. Konrad in language and literature; his wife Natalie Fel'dman, known for their work on a Japanese-Russian dictionary; the late E. M. Kolpakchi, linguistic historian; O. Petrova, head of the Japanese Language Department, Leningrad University (who also does research in the Korean field); and A. E. Gluskina, specialist on ancient Japanese literature. In the history field, Kh. Eidus' *Modern and Contemporary History of Japan*, published in 1955, appears to be a standard item. E. M. Zhukov is also one of the outstanding Soviet authorities on Japanese political and diplomatic history. P. P. Topekha works on political movements, and his most recent publication is highly critical of Rightist trends among the Japanese Socialists. Topekha is currently working on the Meiji Restoration. Several other prominent historians in the Japanese field are N. A. Iofan (early Japan), A. L. Gal'perin (Tokugawa), and A. Sorokin (Russo-Japanese War). Japan's foreign relations have been studied and recently written on by D. I. Gol'dberg (German-Japanese Relations), P. A. Krainov and V. P. Nikhamin (U. S. Relations with Japan), and S. Nevskii (Soviet-Japanese Relations). P. I. Glushakov and Ia. A. Pevzner represent two prominent specialists on Japan's economy. The names of K. M. Popov on natural resources, B. G. Boldyrev on finance, and E. P. Myshkin on history of the working class complete this brief, incomplete roster. The university thesis topics suggest that a crop of young Soviet specialists on Japan is being developed. Theses completed during the past several years (largely at Moscow and Leningrad Universities) include: "Expansive Japanese Imperialism in the Countries of Southeast Asia During World War II"; "Japanese Politics, 1931-1941"; "The Colonial Policies of Japanese Imperialism in Korea, 1931-1941"; "Japan at the Washington Conference, 1921-1922"; "Japanese Imperialism in Manchuria, 1929-1931"; "Aggressive Policies of Japanese Imperialism vis-à-vis the U.S.S.R., 1939-1941"; "American-Japanese Relations Before World War II, 1939-1941"; "Anti-war and Anti-Fascist Movements in Japan, 1935-1937"; "The Aggressive Policies of Japanese Imperialism in China, 1924-1927"; "American-Japanese Imperialist Plottings and the Shantung Question of the Paris Peace Conference, 1919"; and "The Situation of the Working Class of Japan after the Second World War, 1945-1955." These, I was assured by the chief of the International Exchange Department of the Lenin Library, can be made available in the U. S. on microfilm through inter-library purchase.

The field of Korean studies in the Soviet Union is not well developed. That there are relatively few Russian specialists on the area may be explained in part by the fact that a number of Soviet Koreans in Russia are available for technical, language and other such research. Total Soviet output on Korea is probably somewhat greater than in the United States. A selected list of the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies publications on Asia prepared for me recently by the staff of that Institute suggests the relative Soviet emphasis in the Far Eastern field. The list contains only three items on Korea (dated 1952, 1953, and 1956) as opposed, for example, to seven items on Japan, nine on India, ten on China, and ten on Mongolia. Soviet bibliographic works, the

card catalogs of the major research institutes, and the comments of Soviet specialists on Korea with whom I talked confirm this pattern. The Soviets, however, appear to be considerably ahead of us in two categories: specialized studies and translations from Korean authors. With respect to the field of Korean history, concentration is clearly on the past hundred years. As in other areas, the Soviets have recently begun to call attention to pre-Soviet Russian work on Korea.

The several important Soviet Russian specialists on Korea may be mentioned. Professor A. Kholodovich of Leningrad University, who works largely on language and literature, appears to be the dean of the field. Professor O. P. Petrova, head of the Japanese department of Leningrad University, must also be included for her studies of Korean literature. A third important Soviet scholar of Korea is the geographer V. T. Zaichikov whose 1947 geography of Korea has been translated into English by Albert Parry with an introduction and notes supplied by Shannon McCune. A fourth name is that of G. D. Tiagai who ranges over nineteenth-century Korean history, but whose principal study appears to be *Peasant Rebellion in Korea, 1893-1895*. It is difficult to single out any one economist. Among the prolific Russian writers on Korean economy is E. A. Pigulevskaia, whose book, *The Korean People in the Struggle for Independence and Democracy*, was published at the Institute of Economics in 1952. Other Soviet specialists who have recently written on economic developments in Korea are: S. Postnikov (*The Economic and Cultural Construction of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea*), N. M. Shubnikov (*The Situation in Young Korea*), G. N. Bazhenov (*The Korean People's Democratic Republic on the Road to Reconstruction and Development of The National Economy*), and L. N. Karshinov ("The Foreign Trade of the Korean People's Democratic Republic"). On contemporary history and politics few writers have produced a number of recent, short books. These turn out to be more in the nature of travel and popular accounts—usually highly propagandistic—than substantial research pieces. Characteristic of these are: N. P. Khokhlov, *Korea in Our Day* (1956), L. M. Kolbin, *The Korean Democratic Republic* (1957) and U. Ye. Kornilov, *Twenty Days in Korea* (1957). Two recently completed theses seem more interesting: "The National Liberation Struggle of the Korean People Against Japanese Imperialism, 1918-1931" and "The Struggle of the Korean People for the Freedom and Independence of their Country and the Position of the Soviet Union, 1945-1954."

India and Pakistan, as has been suggested, are areas where the Soviets have only recently begun to concentrate. The chief Soviet authorities on India, A. M. Diakov (on modern India) and the late I. M. Reisner (period of the Moghuls), both professors of Moscow University, are the authors of an important article in *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, No. 5 of 1956, reevaluating the importance of Gandhi. A. L. Levkovskii specializes in the Indian economy, and A. A. Smeev has written a book on the economy of Pakistan—incidentally perhaps the only Soviet book devoted solely to Pakistan to have appeared to date. While the volume of Soviet writings on India generally is not as much as that on Persia,

it is increasing rapidly. Some of the more recent writers are L. R. Gordon on agrarian relations with special reference to Pathans, G. G. Kotovskii and V. G. Rastiannikov also on agrarian questions, M. I. Rubinshtein on the Indian economy, K. A. Antonova on Moghul India. On Indian literature the greatest authority is the late A. P. Barannikov.⁷

A comment or two on Soviet specialists on Central Asia (Sinkiang, Tibet, and Mongolia) may also be included. There appears to be no one leading specialist on Sinkiang. The late S. Malov was the authority on the Uigur language. Recent developments in the province have been described by I. B. Shavel, V. F. Kasatkin, K. Kotov (Alma Ata), and A. G. Iakovlev. E. V. Bunakov is studying relations between Russia and Sinkiang in the nineteenth century. With respect to Soviet specialists on Tibet, two names in the area of history and international relations may be put forward without attempting to distinguish as to their place in the field: V. P. Leont'ev on foreign expansion in Tibet, 1889–1919; B. P. Gurevich, who recently published a work entitled "Struggle of the Chinese People for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet." As to Soviet specialists and works on Mongolia, it may be well to defer to those several authorities in the United States. Mention should be made, however, of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' recent (1953) bibliography of books and journal literature on Mongolia in the Russian language, 1935–1950 (*Mongol'skaia Narodnaia Respublika; bibliografiia knizhnoi i zhurnal'noi literatury na russkom iazyke, 1935–1950 gg.*) which constitutes, in effect, a rather complete roster of Soviet specialists on Mongolia.⁸

Southeast Asia appears to be a relatively recent and minor interest of the Soviet specialists. There are surprisingly few specialists for any of the six areas. The contemporary origin and undeveloped nature of this field is reflected on several levels: (1) in the language and area programs, which for Indonesia, Vietnam, etc. are very new and still quite small; (2) the relatively few specialists working on the area within the principal Soviet research centers (only a total of 15 or 20 for Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines combined at the Academy of Sciences' Oriental Institute); and (3) the thinness of research and lack of substantial Soviet writings for any of the regions. Nevertheless, a few specialists who have recently published in the field may be noted. The first name that comes to mind is that of A. A. Guber, who ranges widely over the area. In the case of Burma, I. P. Minaev has written on the prewar history; B. Vasil'ev writes on postwar developments ("The National Liberation Movement in Burma After World War II, 1945–1950," "Contemporary Burma," "The Working Class and the Liberation Movement in Burma during the Second World War," etc.). D. D. Ostapenko writes on politics and law ("The Constitution of the Burmese Republic," etc.). In the foreign relations area mention may be made of O. F. Solov'ev, who has written on relations be-

⁷ I am indebted to Colonel G. E. Wheeler, Director of the Central Asian Research Center, London, for information regarding Soviet specialists on India and Pakistan and for some further data regarding Sinkiang as well as for his generally helpful suggestions.

⁸ Professor Robert Rupen of Bryn Mawr College, who visited the Soviet Union in 1956, is exceptionally well informed on Soviet-Mongolian studies and resources.

tween Russia and Burma in the nineteenth century. L. Tsvetaeva on British imperialism in postwar Burma and S. Naumov on Soviet-Burmese cooperation. Vietnam appears to be an area where the Soviets are encouraging specialization. Several promising young Soviet researchers are currently engaged in language study and "fieldwork" in the area. The past two or three years have seen a sharp rise in the number of publications on the area though the quality and value of the research still remains doubtful. K. K. Klopotov, A. P. Leont'ev, O. K. Kotik, S. A. Mkhitarian, and V. Osipov have written general short "struggle accounts" of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. O. A. Arturov has written on the state structure of the Democratic Republic. A. Dubrovskii writes on economic progress in the area, as does R. A. Popovinka, who recently wrote: "The Dominance of French Monopolistic Capital in the Economy of Indochina." S. Bruk and I. Ia. Podkopaev have produced short works on the ethnography of the region. Academic interest in Indonesia, as in the case of Vietnam, is of surprisingly recent origin. The specialists and their work do not appear impressive. Mention again may be made of characteristic new works: T. Ershov, "The Indonesian People in the Struggle for Peace and National Liberation"; A. P. Kholopova, "The Republic of Indonesia"; V. I. Perov, "Independent Indonesia." D. V. Bekleshov, A. Baturin, and K. K. Shublazde deal with economic developments. A recent thesis is L. M. Demin, "Japanese Aggression in Indonesia during World War II," completed in the Oriental Institute in 1955. There has been a very poor yield of specialists and research on Thailand, Malaya, and the Philippines. A. A. Smirnov and R. A. Tuzmukhamedov write on Thailand's political developments, while N. V. Nikolaeva studies the economy of Thailand. With respect to Malaya, V. S. Rudnev and I. Efanov have published on the "peoples' liberation movement." G. I. Levinson appears to be the outstanding Soviet student of the Philippines.⁹

Finally, it remains to note briefly the principal Soviet periodicals devoted primarily to specialized work on Asia. The most important group of such periodicals originates with the Institute of Oriental Studies: *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie* [*Soviet Oriental Studies*], *Sovremennyi Vostok* [*The Contemporary East*], *Kratkiiia Soobshcheniia Instituta Vostokovedeniia* [*Brief Reports of the Institute of Oriental Studies*], and *Uchenye zapiski, Institut Vostokovedeniia* [*Studies, Institute of Oriental Studies*]. The first issue of a new journal of Chinese Studies, *Sovetskoe Kitaevedenie* [*Soviet Chinese Studies*] appeared in January 1958 under the auspices of the Institute of Chinese Studies of the Academy of Sciences.¹⁰

A few tentative conclusions regarding the nature and scope of Soviet training and research on the "East" are suggested by even so brief and incomplete a review. They are: first, that the Soviets have very recently launched a major

⁹ A valuable review of recent Soviet publications on South and Southeast Asia is Alvin Rubinstein's "Selected Bibliography of Soviet Works on Southern Asia, 1954-56," *JAS*, XVII (Nov. 1957), 43-54.

¹⁰ Other periodicals of the Institutes of History, Economics, Ethnography, Languages, World Economics, and International Relations, etc. in which articles on Asia often appear are listed by Rubinstein on p. 44n.

training and research effort apparently designed to fill in research and personnel gaps in their total national resources on modern Asia; second, that China and India appear to be the focal points of this intensive effort; third, that the African and Southeast Asian areas are surprisingly weak latecomers to the Soviet "social science" scene—earlier academic work on any of the two having been largely confined to linguistics, ethnology, and history; fourth, that language and area training programs are substantial and, in the case of the former, compare favorably with—indeed, in some aspects may be superior to—similar programs in the United States, though the U. S. appears considerably ahead in number, range, and size of programs, and is, of course, less limited by ideological restraints; fifth, that the Soviets still seem strongest in linguistics, history, geography, and ethnography, the traditional Russian areas of concentration, even though they are making a concerted effort to expand and strengthen work on modern Asian history, politics, economics, and international relations; sixth, that the major Soviet libraries are poor in Western sources on Asia, though some of these publications appear to be available in "restricted Institute collections" to a rather wide range of specialists in the field; and seventh, that with respect to research materials in Asian languages—especially on China, Korea and Central Asia—the Soviets have the advantage of accessibility and varying degrees of control of the areas.

These developments probably result from an increasing Soviet awareness of the inadequacy of their social science training and research on major areas of Asia; from an implicit recognition of Western, especially U. S. superiority in many of these fields, accompanied by an urgent desire to catch up; and, finally, from the greater opportunities or possibilities for a wider range of such inquiry engendered by the domestic and foreign-policy changes of the post-Stalin era.

Russian-Mongol-Chinese Conference

(Report contributed by Professor
Robert A. Rupen, Bryn Mawr College.)

Recent reports of a ten-day conference of Russian, Mongol, and Chinese scholars held in Ulan Bator, capital of the Mongolian People's Republic, in November of 1956, illuminate: (1) one form of Soviet-Chinese intellectual cooperation, with the Mongols as intermediaries; (2) another phase of renewed Chinese involvement in Outer Mongolian affairs; (3) recent publications and work in Mongolian studies, and plans for the future; and (4) the personalities involved in contemporary Mongolian studies in the three countries.¹

¹ The reports on which this account is based are: Shao Hsun-cheng, "Ho-pien Meng-ku t'ung-shih ti san-kuo hsueh-che hui-yi" ["Recording the Conference of Scholars from Three Countries on the Cooperative Compilation of a History of Mongolia"], *Hsin chien she* [New Construction], No. 3 (March 1957), pp. 63-65; [N. Shastina], "Soveshchanie istorikov-mongolovedov v Ulan-Batore" ["Conference of Historians—Mongolian Specialists in