

FRÉDÉRIC ROUSTAN

From Oriental Studies to South Pacific Studies: The Multiple Origins of Vietnamese Studies in Japan, 1881 to 1951

Production of contemporary knowledge on Vietnam in Japan began in the early 1880s with Japanese Oriental Studies [Tōyōgaku 東洋学]. However, it wasn't until the early 1930s that Vietnam became a topic of study at universities on the Japanese mainland. The knowledge produced before this time was almost exclusively the result of non-academic and non-institutional research. This article explains how Japanese knowledge of Vietnam evolved within the framework of the two distinct geographical concepts that defined Japanese learning on Asia: the Orient and South Pacific. I attempt to understand how a particular area of research was structured in relation to institutions, research methodologies, and the various actors who helped shape Vietnamese Studies in Japan.

Because of its colonial domination of Vietnam, France was the world leader in Vietnamese Studies for a long time, developing a dense network of academic knowledge via institutions, many of which are now over a century old.¹ And despite its historical past, the discipline is still undeniably alive today. However, it would be wrong to assume that this academic interest was, and remains, the exclusive domain of French researchers. In 2001, one of the pre-eminent Japanese specialists of Vietnam claimed that Japan was the country where the discipline was the most active in the world.² He based this

assertion on the number of researchers active in this field.³ One may question the validity of this assertion, but one needs only to consult the annual bibliographies published in the Japanese journal, *Southeast Asia: History and Culture* [*Tōnan Ajia: Rekishi to Bunka* 東南アジア: 歴史と文化], since its creation in 1971 to be convinced of the richness and indisputable vitality of this area of research in Japan over the past decades. Even more convincing is the work by the so-called “Vietnam War Generation” and their successors, whose scholarship was guided by an approach known as “Area Studies.” Area Studies was established institutionally and then developed by the Japanese government from the 1950s onward. However, both Japanese researchers and the Japanese government began displaying scientific interest in Vietnam long before the Second Indochina War.

The first seeds of Vietnamese Studies in Japan were sown during the Meiji period (1868–1912). This time of transition towards a political system modeled on European states, and constructed around the idea of the nation-state, was also marked by the inception of Japanese colonial expansion in Asia in 1879.⁴ For the first half of the twentieth century, production of knowledge on Asia, and academia as a whole, were tributary to the development of these two interrelated phenomena. My aim in this article is not to compile an extensive bibliographical study, but rather to present the context in which this research was produced.⁵ At the same time, I emphasize the interconnections between researchers and institutions over a period that extends from the early 1880s to the emergence of Area Studies in the early 1950s.⁶ As was also the case of Asian Studies produced by other colonial powers in Asia, the production of specialized knowledge in Japan was related to the country’s need for knowledge. Because of this, I will also situate the development of Japanese studies on Vietnam within the wider colonial expansion of the Japanese nation-state that was born with Meiji and ended paradoxically with the occupation of Japan itself between 1945 and 1952. First, I address Japanese orientalism, the basic framework for Asian Studies in Japan. I then explain the birth and development of Vietnamese Studies in the non-academic world during the 1920s, followed by its gradual institutional assimilation in the 1930s. Finally, I discuss the development of Vietnamese Studies during the Second World War.

Japanese Orientalism: A New Nation-State and Colonial Empire

In 1868, even as Japan was reopening to the world, it embarked on a period of intensive modernization. This transition conveyed a desire to abandon a model of civilization influenced by the Chinese, in favor of a European model; indeed, in the view of Japan's leaders, modernization was synonymous with Westernization. The new Japanese state was constructed on a symbolic return of power to the emperor. The political decision-makers of the Meiji Restoration established a modern imperial state that incorporated principles of nation-statehood as they existed in certain Western countries at the time.⁷ These efforts to push through institutional reforms of the state and political system to establish a centralized state resulted in the promulgation, in 1889, of a constitution that provided for an elected legislature while placing the emperor at the center of the nation-state. These structural reforms were complemented by spiritual nation-building: a national culture based on the concept of national essence [*kokutai* 国体] was invented and circulated via the new system of national education and new media networks. Finally, agriculture, industry, infrastructure, the banking system, and the army were also subjected to the same process of radical modernization and development as political institutions.

Japan did not limit itself to evolving internally, however. In its desire to join the ranks of so-called civilized nations and escape the colonial yoke of the Western powers, the Japanese state embarked on a process of colonial expansion. Colonialism was perceived as a necessary element of the country's development into a modern nation—indeed as an essential part of building a national identity similar to other Western powers. After annexing the independent kingdom of the Ryukyu Islands, Japan engaged in its first war with China in 1894 and colonized Taiwan in 1895. Then, after the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, Japan occupied the Liaotung Peninsula and Sakhalin Island. Finally, after fifteen years of disguised domination, Japan officially colonized Korea in 1910. However, Japanese colonial expansion in Asia did not stop with the end of the Meiji period in 1912. In 1914, thanks to its positioning on the side of the Allies during the First World War, Japan took possession of the German colonial territories in Micronesia. This cluster of islands belong to a region called the South Pacific [*Nan'yō* 南洋], which

theoreticians of the expansion and political leaders perceived as falling within Japan's sphere of economic influence. From the mid 1930s this area was included in the sphere of Japanese colonial expansion. Following the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese state, with the help of semi-private enterprises, continued to progressively extend its influence on the Asian continent. On September 18, 1931, the Japanese army, whose power within the state had grown since the beginning of the Showa period in 1926, took advantage of a pretext to officialize Japan's colonial presence in Manchuria. The pursuit of militarism and Japanese imperial ambitions in China led to conflict between the two countries in 1937 and a war that ended only with the fall of Japan's empire in 1945.

The evolution of Japan's relations with Asia from the Meiji period onward awakened new intellectual interest in this region, as well as a desire for information on the part of those actors invested in Japan's overseas expansion. As a result, new areas of research related to this part of the world appeared both in Colonial Studies and Oriental Studies. Oriental Studies, or *Tōyōgaku*, first developed in Japan during the mid-Meiji period within the dual context of building a strong nation-state on the inside linked to the building of a colonial empire on the outside, in Asia. These two projects went hand in hand.⁸ The new discipline of Oriental Studies was not only the spearhead of a new historical science in Japan, but also the means for historians to construct a Japanese national identity in opposition to both Asia and the West.⁹ The geographical concept of the Orient [*Tōyō* 東洋] originally applied to all that was not the West.¹⁰ Thus the Orient designated the region of common origin with other Asian countries, but also, and especially, the locus of a contemporary separation from these origins.¹¹ During the early Meiji period, the region defined as the Orient included the whole area from Eastern Europe to the Middle East, India, continental Asia and Japan.¹² Asia and the Orient were similar concepts that included Japan and had China as their main constituent.

Oriental Studies was initially developed by academics within their institutions. The first generation became active around the turn of the twentieth century and comprised mainly of historians specializing in China, such as Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉 (1865–1942), a professor of Oriental History in the Faculty of Arts of the Tokyo Imperial University (hereafter *Todai*);

Ichimura Sanjirō 市村瓚次郎, a professor of Chinese at Todai; and Naitō Torajirō 内藤虎撰 (1866–1934), a professor and founder of the Chinese Studies Department in the Faculty of Arts of the Kyoto Imperial University.¹³ These authors—who had a profound influence on following generations—produced a vast body of work without any true geographical specialization and developed historical theories to buttress the concept of the Orient. The next generation of academics to emerge, in the 1920s, began to specialize in particular countries or periods.¹⁴ After the Russo-Japanese War, departments of Oriental History were established in several Japanese academic institutions. The trend increased following the rise of colonialism and with the university decree [*daigakurei* 大学令] of December 6, 1918, which endowed the status of university to several academic institutions other than the five Japanese Imperial Universities.¹⁵

Alongside universities, there also appeared a new type of orientalist institution whose purpose was to organize and assist academics working in the same field. In 1905, Shiratori established the first organization of this kind, the Asia Research Society [Aja Gakkai 亜細亜学会], as a way of bringing together the various actors of the discipline at regular intervals. He continued along this line with the Oriental Library [Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫], which was established as a private foundation in 1917 by Baron Iwasaki, son of the founder of Mitsubishi, and opened in 1924. Shiratori became the director of the research and library departments in 1924 and in 1939 he became general director. A combination of library, archive and research center, these institutions offered Japanese researchers an opportunity to work in a center comparable to the orientalist institutes of Europe, with access to plentiful documentary resources.¹⁶ The Oriental Library's initial collection consisted of the books of Dr. Georges Ernest Morrison, the London Times Peking correspondent. Although not a university institute per se, it had all the hallmarks of one, and could be seen as an extension of the Oriental History Department at Todai in both its membership and the topics pursued by researchers.¹⁷

The second type of institution was, like the first, closely linked to the academic world and its members, but produced a different kind of scholarship: these were private institutes financed by economic interest groups, and they generated the lion's share of Japanese research on Asia before the Second

World War. The largest of these institutions was the South Manchuria Railway Company Research Center, established by Shiratori in 1908.¹⁸ The South Manchuria Railway Company, or Mantetsu 満鉄, originated as a semi-governmental project to build a railway in Manchuria in 1907, after the Russo-Japanese War.¹⁹ Most of the research on Asia produced in Japan prior to 1945 was carried out within Mantetsu's various research centers.²⁰ Additionally, the East Asia Common Culture Society [Tōa Dōbun Kai 東亜同文会] and its sister school, the East Asia Common Culture Academy [Tōa Dōbun Shoin 東亜同文書院], established in Shanghai in 1901, played an important role in the production of Japanese orientalism.²¹ The East Asia Common Culture Society was formed in 1898 to teach Chinese and train young Japanese as China specialists in order to take advantage of economic opportunities in China. Thanks to funding from Japanese industrial groups and the government, the association developed rapidly, soon expanding beyond its original mandate and participating in the colonial activities of Japanese expansion in Asia. Although academics principally focused on oriental history from antiquity to the premodern era, the research centers concentrated their efforts on contemporary issues with practical applications for the economic, commercial and industrial development of Japan in continental Asia.²² Furthermore, this non-academic research differed in that it was produced outside mainland Japan, in organizations located in countries under Japanese influence, and thus facilitated the pursuit of intensive fieldwork. Japanese orientalist were aware of the relationship between science and its political uses. Shiratori was the first to make the distinction between “practical” science like that produced in research centers such as Mantetsu, on the one hand—science in the service of national interests be they political or economic—and theoretical or philologically “pure” science like that pursued in universities. The latter was expected to remain aloof from all the considerations that justified the existence of the former.²³ However, academic knowledge, despite its claim to independence from politics, contributed to the development of Japanese cultural nationalism with the omnipresent Professor Shiratori at its head.²⁴

During the 1920s, a new generation of researchers influenced by the Marxist ideas then fashionable in Japanese academic circles rejected the research produced by their elders, regardless of the category in which

Shiratori might have placed it.²⁵ But with the rise of militarism during the 1930s the intensification of government control soon muffled dissent.²⁶ Following a wave of conversions both voluntary and forced, by 1938 every researcher in the discipline was cooperating with the various research centers that served Japan's expansion in Asia.²⁷ Gaining a better understanding of neighboring countries was seen as crucial to the success of the Pacific War.²⁸

The Origins of Vietnamese Studies: Knowledge on the Margins of the Orient

The Japanese concept of the Orient did not include the area in which Vietnam is situated. The Indochinese peninsula belonged to another region called the South Pacific, or Nan'yō, a sub-Asian region distinct from both the Orient and the West, which also included the Indian subcontinent, the Malaysian peninsula, and the Pacific islands from Indonesia to New Caledonia.²⁹ The Indochinese peninsula emerged during the 1880s as an offshoot of the Southern Expansion Doctrine, or Nanshinron 南進論, which postulated that this region was vital to the development of Japan.³⁰ The concept was first theorized informally in travelers' tales describing the thousand and one marvels found in these countries and their potential utility for Japan. Awareness of the region increased during the First World War, and private interest groups were formed with the aim of promoting the Japanese presence.³¹ It was not until the 1930s, however, that the Japanese government made the Southward Expansion Doctrine part of its national policy.³² Thus, just as the South Pacific was distinguished from the Orient, South Pacific Studies [Nanyōkenkyū 南洋研究], which encompassed research on the Indochinese peninsula, was initially distinguished from Oriental Studies [Tōyōgaku] despite the fact that they were contemporary disciplines.³³ Within South Pacific Studies, research on French Indochina was categorized as French Indochina Studies [Futsuinkenkyū 仏印研究], and basically consisted of the study of Vietnam under French domination, leaving aside Cambodia and Laos for the most part.³⁴

The inception of French colonization whetted Japan's interest in the Indochinese peninsula. Japanese presence in the territory was directly linked to the French presence: the first Japanese residents were prostitutes known as *karayuki san*, who settled there around 1885 to service the European military

contingent.³⁵ Also, the Japanese government, following the distribution of reports on Franco-Vietnamese relations in 1882 and visits by several Japanese officers from 1884 onward, demonstrated its official interest in Indochina in 1897 by making its first significant diplomatic move with regard to the French colony: the Japanese minister in Paris requested the right to be represented by a consul in Sài Gòn.³⁶

On the level of Japanese production of knowledge, this growing political interest resulted in the publication of a series of works by a military officer, Hikita Toshiaki 引田利章. This work was the first of its kind in the history of Annam (which the Japanese pronounced “Annan”) and Franco-Vietnamese relations.³⁷ In general, before the end of the First World War, Vietnam appears in a body of writing that purports to be grounded in experience: travel books on the South Pacific. These works, which are almost all identical in their structure and content, are rather anecdotal and rarely focus on a single country. Their authors, despite their lack of specialist status, relate their experience as objective. They generally present a brief historical and ethnographic retrospective of Indochina, describe the French colonial system, and review the country’s resources and their potential utility for Japan in economic and migratory perspectives. Finally, they sometimes mention Japanese nationals living in the French colony.³⁸ These works cannot really be classified as Vietnamese Studies. They are, rather, exotic tales characterized by a strong sense of pragmatism associated with the idea of Southern colonial expansion, as their authors were often connected to Japanese colonial circles.³⁹

During the 1920s the production of knowledge reflected the intent for economic expansion of certain Japanese interest groups connected through associations. To quote only one representative example, the work by Maeda Hōjirō 前田宝治郎, *French Indochina [Futsuryō Indochina]* was financed by the main organization lobbying for Japanese economic expansion in the region, the South Seas Association [Nanyōkyōkai 南洋協会], which also had close links to colonial circles.⁴⁰ This private organization was founded in 1915 under the patronage of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Colonial Affairs, with a mission to promote Japanese cultural and economic activity in the region.⁴¹ The association’s most active promoters had close ties to the colonial government of Taiwan or companies present

in the European colonies of Southeast Asia.⁴² This was especially the case of the association's spiritual leader, Konishi Hoshihiko 小西干比古, a retired naval officer, and one of the association's most generous patrons, Ōhashi Chūichi 大橋忠一, an influential official in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.⁴³ From 1929 onward, the association began sending Japanese for business training in Southeast Asia, and in the late 1930s it acted as a recruitment center for people looking for employment with Japanese companies present in the region.⁴⁴

The association's principal mouthpiece was the *South Seas Association Newsletter* [*Nanyōkyōkai Kaihō*] which began publishing articles on Indochina in 1917.⁴⁵ Here, too, the focus was on experience in the field: the first articles on Indochina were contributed by Japanese residents of Tonkin.⁴⁶ Matsushita Mitsuhiro 松下光広, who had lived in Hà Nội since 1912, and Yokohama Masanaga 横山正脩, who had lived in Hải Phòng since 1906, both actively promoted the development of Japanese commercial presence in Vietnam, particularly via a company, Dainan Kōshi 大南公司, set up by Matsushita in 1922.⁴⁷ Most of these articles discuss the economy of Indochina, especially foreign trade, but they also address other topics such as local legislation, ethnic issues, the daily life of Japanese in Indochina, literature, and the colonial government.

Publications on Vietnam written by Japanese residents of French Indochina multiplied with the outbreak of the Pacific War in the form of both articles and books.⁴⁸ The general trend of publications related to Indochina went from roughly four or five books published each year, in the 1930s, to twenty books in 1940, almost seventy in 1941, fifty in 1942, and around twenty in 1943.⁴⁹ Unoriginal and repetitive, these works tirelessly returned to the question of natural resources and their exploitation by the Japanese Empire. In fact, prior to 1942, the book form was essentially reserved for non-academic works, generally on topics far removed from the social sciences.⁵⁰ Published in 1941, *French Indochina Studies* [*Futsuin kenkyū*] was somewhere between a handbook and a travel guide, far from the academic content suggested by its title and quite representative of the many generalist books published at that time.⁵¹ Similarly, *French Indochina: Politics and Economy* [*Futsuryōindosina: Seiji, keizai*] is another example of the quasi-unique stream of interest in trade, industry and economics.⁵²

In contrast to the approaches outlined above, another association, the East Asia Common Culture Society, also produced a scholarship based on fieldwork via its school, and later, its university. With regard to the production of knowledge about Asia, the society's most original contribution was the graduation theses written by students of the East Asia Common Culture Academy.⁵³ During their final year, these students were required to complete a six-week to six-month "long journey" [*dairyokō* 大旅行] in China or another Asian country. These were the first systematic fieldwork-based research projects carried out on a large scale within a Japanese orientalist institution. Each group of students had to study a specific topic and area, using a very rigorous method of research and data collection.⁵⁴ Their fieldnotes were then written up as graduation theses. The thoroughness of this fieldwork seems to have been much appreciated, for the theses were then distributed to the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the army high command, which used them for decision-making. Their value and interest lies in their rigorous and unvarying methodology, devised by a group of professors at the East Asia Common Culture Academy.⁵⁵ This strictly objective methodology led Tsuchiya Kenji 土屋健治, one of Japan's most respected practitioners and theoreticians of Area Studies, to remark that the idea and practice of his discipline as developed in Japan in the 1960s was not in fact new: it already existed before the Pacific War.⁵⁶ Its focus, however, was different. Before the war, the data collected by these methods were used to answer the question of Japan's place in the world; after the 1950s they were used to study the national construction of decolonized countries. Japanese Asian Studies turned the question of identity back towards other countries while preserving the methods of data collection developed by Japanese orientalism. For Tsuchiya, the data collection methods used during the two periods hardly differed, but the way the data were interpreted had changed. Thus, the *dairyokō* was an important methodological turning-point for Japanese orientalist research. Between 1910 and 1930, students made twenty-seven study trips to regions that included French Indochina.⁵⁷ These particular travelogues describe places, populations, customs, and many other details. This accumulation of raw descriptive data remains a very valuable source of study on Vietnam during the colonial period.⁵⁸

Almost no academic scholarship on Vietnam was produced before the 1930s, despite the establishment of the first teaching position for South Pacific history [*Nan'yōshi* 南洋史] within the history department of the National University of Taihoku [Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku 台北帝国大学] in Taiwan, in 1928.⁵⁹ The second professor to fill this position, Iwao Seiichi 岩生成一 (1900–1988), specialized in the history of Japanese communities in the region.⁶⁰ The South Pacific countries were thus not studied for themselves but in relation to the Japanese presence within their borders for reasons that are obvious given the Japanese colonial context. At the same time, the word “Tōnan Ajia 東南アジア” [Southeast Asia] started to be used in schoolbooks. Hence, starting at this time, Japan included this area in what they considered to be Asia. This simple fact denotes the point at which the concept of Asia began to expand southwards, facilitating an ethno-cultural convergence between the region and Japan that did not exist previously.⁶¹ Scholarship on the region would grow common roots and forge connections with it, as Oriental Studies did with China. The image of Vietnam as depicted in Japanese research at that time is that of an underdeveloped country that needed Japan to liberate it.

Furthermore, unlike the government of mainland Japan, the governments-general of Korea, and especially Taiwan, with the creation of the Taiwan Government General Secretariat Research Section [Sōtoku Nanbō Chōsaka 台湾総督南房調査課], developed a lively and early interest in the French colony and published a number of books on Indochina.⁶² The three main topics they address are the French colonial system, trade relations between Indochina and the Japanese Empire, and Japanese emigration to Indochina.⁶³ These are essentially translations of statistical or legal data. However, as both the Japanese presence in Indochina and trade between the two countries were very limited prior to 1941, very little was published on colonial Vietnam in comparison to the Dutch East Indies or the Philippines.⁶⁴

Colonial Expansion and the Development and Diversification of Academic Research in Universities

Beginning in the mid 1930s, research began to emerge from universities on the Japanese mainland as Japanese colonial expansion resumed in full force. South Pacific Studies did not constitute a separate category within academic

research in mainland Japan, as was the case for non-academic research and even for academic research on Indochina, which was limited to precolonial Vietnam.⁶⁵ South Pacific Studies appeared, rather, as a peripheral area within Chinese Studies. The few academic articles published prior to 1930 appeared in history journals devoted to Oriental Studies.⁶⁶ In these academic journals, studies of the South Pacific region were a subcategory of Oriental history; this was also the case in academic societies.⁶⁷ From the point of view of university researchers, the region was part of the Orient, and the works in question, which included research on Annam, were based on Chinese documents. The country was thus presented as belonging to a sphere under Chinese influence.

Researchers at first focused on premodern Vietnamese history and studied relations between China and the Indochinese peninsula from various angles: politics, law, trade, family structure, and the history of Vietnamese independence from China. Among the founders of this academic discipline, Sugimoto Naojirō 杉本直治郎 (1890–1976), a graduate of Kyoto Imperial University and professor at the University of Hiroshima, was the first to begin studying the history of premodern Vietnam in the early 1920s.⁶⁸

However, without a doubt the towering figure of what one might call the first generation of Vietnam specialists in Japan was Prof. Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎 (1910–2001).⁶⁹ As a student at Todai he studied Oriental history under Ikeuchi Hiroshi 池内宏 (1878–1952) and Wada Sei 和田清 (1890–1963), two former students of Shiratori who specialized in continental Asia.⁷⁰ Prof. Yamamoto gave his first lecture at Todai in 1940 and in 1957 became the first Professor of Southeast Asian Studies in the Department of Oriental History at Todai, a position he occupied until 1971.⁷¹ He began publishing in 1933 and in 1938 wrote his first notable article about Vietnam following a trip to Indochina in 1936.⁷² During his stay, under the mentorship of Professor Georges Coedès (1886–1969), who had been the director of the *Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient* [French School of the Far East (EFEO)] since 1929, Prof. Yamamoto gained access to a wealth of primary sources as well as numerous studies published by the school. This trip also marked the beginning of a solid relationship between Japanese academics focusing on the region and EFEO researchers. These links grew stronger during the Second World War, and from 1940 to 1942, Yamamoto, by then an assistant professor at The

Eastern Culture Institute [Tōhō Bunka Gakuin 東方文化学院], returned to Vietnam once more with the help of Professor Coedès.⁷³ Based on this research, he then began to publish a series of articles on the history of Annam.⁷⁴ Close ties to the French orientalist institution were a necessity for any researcher wishing to study Vietnam because the EFEO was the only center of knowledge production imbued with an unquestionable scientific aura in the field of Indochinese Studies.⁷⁵ In 1902, the international Far Eastern Studies Conference organized by the EFEO in Hà Nội allowed links to be established with participating Japanese researchers that led to individual collaboration between members of the EFEO and these Japanese orientalists, especially as of the 1920s.⁷⁶ Indeed, there was no free access to the field or to Vietnamese scholars. Researchers therefore had to pass through the French colonial power and its research institutes, where documents were collected.

Prof. Matsumoto Nobuhiro 松本信広 (1897–1981) was another important contributor to the emergence of Vietnamese Studies within Japanese orientalism. Between 1924 and 1928, he studied Austro-Asiatic languages at the Sorbonne where he obtained his doctorate.⁷⁷ After returning to Japan, he became a lecturer in the Department of Literature at Keio University in Tokyo, and then in the Department of Oriental History. Thanks to his mastery of French and classical Chinese, after his first trip to Indochina in 1933 he began to develop an interest in Annam Studies [Annan kenkyū 安南研究].⁷⁸ On this occasion, with the help of Paul Pelliot and his brother-in-law, Emile Gaspardonne, he obtained permission to make a copy of the *The Annals of Đại Nam* [Đại Nam Thực Lục], a chronicle of the Nguyễn imperial dynasty written in Chinese, which was seen as a needed building block for translating and developing Vietnamese Studies in Japan and in Japanese.⁷⁹ Between 1934 and 1935, he published articles in Indochina in French.⁸⁰ His writings on history, ethnology and the Vietnamese language represented the first step towards the study of contemporary Vietnam within Japanese universities.⁸¹

Like the two founding fathers, professors Yamamoto and Matsumoto, the first generation of orientalists active in Annam Studies were not, strictly speaking, Vietnam specialists. Their interests lay principally in the area of the South Pacific, and the territories that made up the French colony were thus often part of a list of varying length. Similarly, the scope of their research was not clearly defined, and their methodology ranged from history to ethnology

and archeology, not to mention philology. They were for the most part trained in classical oriental history, principally Chinese history, with a documentary approach characteristic of this background. Consequently, they studied Vietnamese history through documents written in Chinese. Furthermore, this generation also shared a mastery of French, which for some authors resulted in considerable reliance on the research of the EFEO, although it would be wrong to assume that the Japanese research was nothing more than a simple translation of French orientalism. In sum, the two main roads to Vietnam went through China and France.

The Second World War and the Expansion of Vietnamese Studies

Though the period of the Second World War did not revolutionize the field of Vietnamese Studies, it nevertheless opened up new possibilities. The Pacific War, and the shared domination of Indochina by France and Japan as of September 1940, created new needs for the Japanese government. In a bid to respond to this new situation, governmental agencies as well as private institutions expanded and multiplied their research centers on Asia.⁸² Among the noteworthy institutional reorganizations devoted to the war effort in Asia, the Southeast Asia Field Research Group [Nanpō Haken Chōsadan 南方派遣調査団], created by Japanese military authorities in China, stands out. It grouped together both private and public institutions. Its members included the Tokyo Commercial University [Tōkyō Shōka Daigaku 東京商科大学]; the South Manchuria Railway Company Research Center [Minami-Manshū Tetsudō Kabushiki-Gaisha Kenkyūjo 南滿州鉄道株式会社研究所], which was reorganized in 1939; the East Asiatic Economic Investigation Bureau [Tōa Keizai Chōsakyoku 東亜經濟調査局]; the Mitsubishi Economic Research Center [Mitsubishi Keizai Kenkyūjo 三菱經濟研究所]; and the Pacific Association [Taiheiyōkyōkai 太平洋協會] created in 1938, which published a number of general reference works on Indochina.⁸³ In addition to the above consortium, the following research groups also deserve mention: the East Asia Research Institute [Tōa Kenkyūjo 東亜研究所] created in 1938; the East Asia Economic Research Institute [Tōa Keizai Kenkyūjo 東亜經濟研究所]; the South Sea Economic Research Institute [Nan'yō Keizai Kenkyūjo 南洋經濟研究所]; and the Indochina Economic

Research Institute [Indoshina Keizai Kenkyūjo 印度支那經濟研究]. All of these institutes published works on Indochina, but this was particularly true for the last institution, directed by Harada Toshiaki 原田敏明 and created in Hà Nội in 1943 by Yamane Dōichi 山根道一, a political activist and director of the Indochinese Company of Commerce and Industry [Compagnie Indochinoise de Commerce et d'Industrie], the Tonkinese branch of the Taiwan Development Company Limited [Takushoku Kabushiki Kaisha 台湾拓殖株式会社].⁸⁴

The demand for knowledge largely outstripped the institutional capacity to produce it; the government, furthermore, had mobilized European Studies specialists for their language skills, in order to read books and documents in French, English or Dutch.⁸⁵ The scholars who were sent out, such as Kuroki Yoshinori 黒木義典, a professor of French at the former Osaka School of Foreign Languages [Osaka Gaikokugo Gakkō 大阪外国語学校], were limited to administrative work translating documents of all kinds and did not conduct research in the field.⁸⁶ Similarly, the majority of scholarly publications and reports consisted of translations of works already published by European colonial institutions. However, simultaneously with these translations, exposure to the field led to greater thematic diversification and helped structure the discipline.⁸⁷

The Asian research activities of Mantetsu peaked from 1940 to 1941. The company's center was the largest Japanese orientalist enterprise during the war years, employing 2,145 researchers in 1941, with a budget of 8 million Yen.⁸⁸ Its research groups declined after 1942, however, as the military intensified its repression of civilian members of private agencies working for the government. This led to the imprisonment of liberal or Marxist scholars, or those suspected of such leanings—which was the case of many of Mantetsu researchers.⁸⁹ During the 1930s, the company recruited outstanding researchers who could best serve Japanese military interests, regardless of their political views. A number of researchers were opposed to the Japanese government policy. However, until the battle of Midway in June 1942, as long as they did not conduct research on social structures in Japan, scholars of various leftist convictions were not harassed, as the imperative need for knowledge forced the military authorities to compromise.⁹⁰ Furthermore, Marxist methodology was widely accepted among Japanese academics of the 1930s,

particularly economists.⁹¹ However, repression was not unheard of. Arrests of researchers working for Mantetsu research centers began in 1941 before accelerating in great numbers in 1942 and draining the company of qualified scholars and researchers.⁹² Faced with the possibility that it would not be able to pursue its research projects, the center was reorganized in 1943 with one-third fewer researchers and re-centered its work on the company's activities in railroad as well as geological research on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic.

Before 1943, Mantetsu researchers' work focused principally on Japan, China and Manchuria. Indochina was addressed within the South Pacific Research Group, but did not belong to any defined area.⁹³ As a result, it remained a very marginal subject in Mantetsu's total output.⁹⁴ Of the six thousand two hundred research documents produced by Mantetsu's various research centers during its almost forty years of existence, less than fifty discuss the French colony, either exclusively or in part. Nevertheless, originally the research projects were ambitious, particularly from a methodological standpoint: researchers intended to take advantage of Japanese domination over the various territories in order to carry out fieldwork with a clear emphasis on sociopolitical topics. The reality, however, was that their assignments in various Asian countries often turned into consulting work for the Japanese army. Thus, a research project on wartime economic structures of the Japan–Manchuria–China bloc was reoriented after 1941 to a project evaluating China's resistance to Japanese expansion.⁹⁵ The main research projects from 1939 to 1943 fell under broad areas of study: inflation in the Japan–Manchuria–China bloc, the reorganization of the economy during wartime, the availability of strategic resources for Japan in the Japan–Manchuria–China block, the industrial expansion of Japan, the creation of a new order in Asia.⁹⁶ Publications about Indochina appeared on the margins of these broad topics but mainly addressed economic and industrial issues—a study by the Tokyo Office Bureau, *Economic and Trade Relations between French Indochina and Japan*, for example—or questions related to colonization, as in *The Policy of the French Government of Indochina Towards the Annamese*.⁹⁷ Research on Indochina in other centers was, like Mantetsu's, generally limited and uninnovative. It was produced by non-specialists, and often it got lost amidst research that focused increasingly on China.

Colonial expansion and the development of Vietnamese Studies were closely linked during this period. The Research Institute for South Asian Culture [Minami Ajia Bunka Kenkyūjo 南アジア文化研究所], was created by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1939, under the directorship of Shiratori and supported by the Ministry, the Intelligence Bureau and the Government of Taiwan. Unlike most centers, which focused on economic and political issues, the initial objectives of the Research Institute for South Asian Culture were cultural: the study of the history, beliefs, languages, ethnic groups, and societies of Southeast Asia.⁹⁸ During its first two years of operation, the institute adopted an ambitious program (the publication of books and a journal, *Academic Bulletin of South Asia* [Minami Ajia Gakuhō]; the creation of an archival collection; and five research areas), in which the majority of academics working on Annam participated.⁹⁹

In addition to the need for cultural knowledge essential to any colonial venture, the Research Institute for South Asian Culture's publications program reflected an effort to historicize the Japanese presence in this part of the world. This is especially perceptible in the works of Iwao Seiichi 岩生成一 on Japanese villages in the South Pacific and research projects on Greater Asia.¹⁰⁰ Building on research he had begun in 1929 at the National University of Taihoku, Iwao continued to study the establishment of Japanese communities in the area in the fifteenth to seventeenth century and their economic, political and military influence on the kingdoms of this period. The theme of Japanese relations with the region, developed during the 1920s, became very fashionable towards the late 1930s as others began to emulate Iwao's works.¹⁰¹ This theme can be considered the main topic of Japanese research on the South Pacific prior to 1945.

The Research Institute for South Asian Culture also developed an Indochinese history project, directed by Prof. Yamamoto with the participation of Prof. Matsumoto. This was the only research program devoted exclusively to the history of Indochina (limited in actuality to Cochinchina, Annam and Tonkin) and carried out by academics. It was adopted at the initiative of the two professors. Around the same time, in 1942, Prof. Yamamoto formed the Society for Historical Studies of the South [Nan-shi Gakkai 南史学会] under the auspices of Today's Oriental Cultures Research Institute, established in 1941, with the aim of organizing regular meetings of specialists studying the

region.¹⁰² This initiative to bring together researchers represented an important step in the transformation of a poorly delineated area of research into a full-fledged academic discipline focused almost exclusively on history.

Close contact with the field also helped move the inquiries of Japanese scholars into new directions, such as archeology, sociopolitical questions, or Vietnamese literature in French.¹⁰³ A noteworthy example is that of Prof. Umehara Sueji 梅原末治, an archeologist specializing in Southeast Asia who resided in Indochina from 1942 to 1943 and produced scholarship on the previously unexplored topic of the peninsula during the Bronze Age.¹⁰⁴ Prof. Fujiwara Riichirō 藤原利一郎 was another academic who benefited from an exchange between December 1942 and March 1943 in order to study Vietnam-China relations based on documents in the EFEO collection in Hà Nội, where he received help from Georges Coedès and Henry Parmentier.¹⁰⁵ Likewise, Mineya Tōru 三根谷徹 began studying Vietnamese in Hà Nội at the same period. These works were admittedly few in number, and given the ideological context of Greater East Asia, they were not exactly the product of chance. Yet, they contributed a new perspective on a number of questions not yet addressed by French colonial researchers.

Sociopolitical issues such as the history of Vietnamese nationalist movements or Vietnamese society under French rule were studied by Akiho Ichirō 昭穂一郎 in *Vietnam and the French Policy of Assimilation* [*Annan koku to Furansu no dōka seisaku*] and Kagimoto Hiroshi 鍵本博 in *Vietnamese Society under French Occupation*. [*Furansu ryōyū zengo no Annan shakai*].¹⁰⁶ The career of Prof. Ōiwa Makoto 大岩誠 (1900–1956) serves to show the distinction that must be made between the research institutes and the powers that controlled them and the people who worked in them. Prof. Makoto was probably the most pioneering Japanese scholar of the war period in terms of his research on contemporary Vietnamese society. Between 1939 and 1943, approximately twenty-five of his publications addressed Indochina, not counting his Japanese translations of Western scholarship (by Henri Mouhot, Eveline Maspero, Guy Poree, and Ennis E. Thomas, for example).¹⁰⁷ Prof. Ōiwa was a political scientist in the Department of Law at the Imperial University of Kyoto; then, in 1933, following the Takigawa Incident [Takigawa Jiken 滝川事件] at Kyoto University, he was fired from Kyoto University and took a job at Ritsumeikan, also in Kyoto.¹⁰⁸ In 1930 and 1932 he took a study trip to Europe, particularly Paris and Berlin.

During his stay in Paris he became a member of the French Communist Party, which led him to be jailed in Japan in 1938. In 1939 he was freed after a “reconversion” and joined one of Mantetsu’s research departments at the East Asian Economic Investigation Bureau [Tōa Keizai Chōsakyoku En 満鉄東亜経済調査局編] where he contributed articles to the bureau’s journal, *New Asia* [*Shin Ajia* 新亜細亜].¹⁰⁹ Because of his proficiency in French, he was put in charge of studying the French colony. Prof. Oiwa became interested in a number of novel research topics, such as Caodaism, but especially the history of Vietnamese independence movements. In 1941 he published a pioneering work: *Outline of the History of the Nationalist Movement in Vietnam*.¹¹⁰ In the introduction to this book he explains that his interest in this movement was sparked during his stay in Paris by the Yên Bái Uprising and some “young Vietnamese with noble ideals” whom he met around the same time.¹¹¹ Thus, I believe that his career as a communist activist and his interest in anticolonial movements better explain the originality of his research than the ideology imposed by the Japanese state.¹¹²

Lastly, Japanese research on Vietnam extended to the study of the Vietnamese language. During the Japanese occupation of Indochina, Vietnamese–French–Japanese language manuals were hastily published in order to facilitate everyday relations between the Japanese and the inhabitants of the colony. Essentially phrasebooks written by non-specialists, they offered translations in three languages for expressions such as “260 piasters were stolen; a Chinese must have done it.”¹¹³ I mentioned earlier that scholars of European Studies were mobilized to work, generally as translators, for the Japanese army in the European colonies occupied by Japan. The linguists among them, mostly scholars of French, came into close contact with the Vietnamese through their work and thus began to envisage a new area of study: the Vietnamese language.¹¹⁴ At the time of the Second World War, Japanese academics spoke no Vietnamese; they knew Chinese and French and carried out research exclusively in these two languages. This gap was filled only with the advent of the Vietnam War Generation in the 1970s. The professors who spearheaded Vietnamese language studies were Prof. Matsumoto, a professor at Keiō University and a pioneer in Vietnamese anthropology and contemporary history in Japan, and Kuroki Yoshinori 黒木義典, a professor of French at the Osaka School of Foreign Languages [Osaka Gaikokugo Gakkō 大阪外国語学校] who had worked as a translator

during the war.¹¹⁵ Their influence rested less on their research on the subject than on their role as mentors to the first Vietnamese language specialists who began teaching the language at Japanese universities in the 1960s.¹¹⁶

A follower of Prof. Matsumoto was Kawamoto Kunie 川本邦衛, who studied in 1946 in the Department of Chinese Language at Tokyo Foreign Affairs Vocational College [Tokyo Gaiji Semongakkō 東京外事専門学校].¹¹⁷ After graduation Kawamoto became a postgraduate student at Keiō, studying Chinese literature. There, his relationship with Matsumoto pushed him away from Chinese and in the direction of Vietnamese. Matsumoto told him that his mastery of Chinese meant that he could study all of Asia, including Vietnam.¹¹⁸ In 1958, he became assistant professor in the Chinese Department at Keiō, teaching Chinese language.

A turning point in Japanese Vietnamese Studies came in 1961, when Kawamoto went to Sài Gòn. Between 1961 and 1964 he taught Japanese at the Sài Gòn Teacher Training College as part of Japanese participation in the Colombo Plan, but his real motive, partly under pressure from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was to learn about Vietnamese language and culture.¹¹⁹ In 1964, Kawamoto returned to Keiō University where he taught Chinese and Vietnamese culture, history and language. Kawamoto was not alone in going to Vietnam to study the language.

Another Japanese scholar who did the same during this period was Prof. Takeuchi Yonosuke 竹内与之助, a French instructor at Osaka University of Foreign Languages [Osaka Gaikokugo Daigaku 大阪外国語大学].¹²⁰ Like Kawamoto, Takeuchi went to Sài Gòn to teach Japanese, and while there learned Vietnamese. Takeuchi was influenced by Prof. Kuroki Yoshinori.¹²¹ On Takeuchi's return to Japan he became the first professor of Vietnamese at a Japanese national university and the dean of the first section of Vietnamese specially created by the Japanese Ministry of Education at the Tokyo University of Foreign Languages in 1964.¹²²

Postwar Japan: Change and Continuity in Vietnamese Studies

Close contact between Japan and Indochina during the Second World War accelerated the development of Vietnamese Studies and helped it coalesce into a discipline with more clearly defined characteristics. This period also

saw the appearance of the elements necessary for the emergence, a few years later, of Vietnamese Studies within the framework of Area Studies in Japan. By the end of the war, the only surviving institutions were university departments of Oriental History and Orientalist Academic Societies.¹²³ Private or semi-private institutes disappeared along with the organizations or companies that had created them. Japan was brutally cut off from Asia. Companies that lived for and by Japanese colonization, such as Mantetsu, and organizations like the South Seas Association and Indochina Economic Research Institute, were disbanded along with the colonial empire. After the war ended, all remaining field-based research projects were interrupted and their findings were never published. The postwar period produced characteristically weak research on Asia and, in corollary, Vietnam. Although real advances were made during the war, the dismantling of research centers and limitation of access to the field put an end to research on contemporary Vietnam for a while in favor of historical studies of Asia. Japanese researchers took advantage of this time to increase their international exposure by traveling to Asian research institutions in Europe and North America.¹²⁴

However, Oriental Studies of Southeast Asia had by then become firmly established in Tokyo, Kyoto and Keiō universities. Although there were no departments specializing in the area before 1952, the principal scholars active in these universities, such as professors Yamamoto and Matsumoto, gained visibility thanks to their publications. They continued to organize and define the field, for instance in Tokyo through their contributions of both research and articles to the Society for History of the South, which later became the Southeast Asian Historical Society [Nanpōshi Kenkyūkai 南方史研究会]. They also showed that they had achieved a certain standard of scholarship, as demonstrated in a subtle exercise carried out by Yamamoto in 1947 in a review of Georges Coedès's book, *Ancient History of Hinduized States in the Far East* [*L'histoire ancienne des Etats hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient*], published in the journal *Oriental Bulletin* [*Tōyō Gakuhō 東洋学報*]. Prof. Yamamoto expands, and suggests amendments to, many parts of the book based on Japanese publications on the same topic, thereby showcasing the excellence of Japanese research.¹²⁵

Postwar Vietnamese Studies was dominated by historians of the precolonial period, focusing in particular on the history of Vietnamese law as an

extension of Chinese customs. Academics also began to study the independent dynasties of Vietnam and the kingdom of Champa.¹²⁶ Yamamoto's *Research on the History of Annam*, published in 1950, was a milestone.¹²⁷ Based on research carried out before the war, the book discusses the invasions and conquest of Vietnam by the Yuan and Ming dynasties. The topic of China–Vietnam relations became very popular during the postwar years. The dominance of historical scholarship in this period can also be explained by the almost complete lack of access to the field before 1952. Academics were obliged to work with documents available to them in Japan. Furthermore, the generation of researchers active in the postwar years had not yet specialized in the study of a particular country and continued to publish research on the entire region. However, the creation of a position in Southeast Asian history in 1957 in Tokyo University's Department of Asian History was a decisive step towards greater autonomy for research on the region. This marked the beginning of a new era in Japanese scholarship on Asia, which from thereon would include Vietnam.

In 1947, the first year of the Cold War, the government of Japan, then still under US occupation, began to show signs of interest in the production of knowledge on Asia and what remained of its institutions. The Ministry of Education began subsidizing the Oriental Library, and the following year its collection became a section of the National Library. Toyo Bunko's library was simultaneously reopened to the public. In 1947, the Institute of Eastern Culture [Tōhō Bunka Gakuin 東方文化学院] of Tokyo and the Research Center of Eastern Culture [Tōhō Bunka Kenkyūjo 東方文化研究所] of Kyoto, two branches of a project started in 1929 by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, were also reorganized as the Eastern Academic Society [Tōhō Gakkai 東方学会], which remains an important player in Japanese Asian Studies, as does the Oriental Library. Their survival was not merely institutional, for the term “Nankai 南海” or “South Seas” continued to appear in the very influential *Journal of History* [*Shigaku Zasshi* 史学雑誌] until 1951. Nevertheless, during the postwar years the term “Nan'yō” was progressively refined and replaced with the regional concept of *Tōnan Ajia*, or Southeast Asia.

Japanese research on contemporary Asia also began to revive in 1947 with the creation of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), and later with the establishment in December 1951 of the

Asian Affairs Research Institute [Aja Mondai Chōsakai アジア問題調査会] by a former colonial official, Fujizaki Nobuyuki 藤崎信幸.¹²⁸ In 1958 this academic society became the Institute of Developing Economies [Aja Keizai Kenkyūjo アジア経済研究所], or IDE, and from 1960 on it was administered by the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI).¹²⁹ The IDE was the first research center focusing on Asia to adopt the concept of *chiiki kenkyū* 地域研究, or Area Studies. Around the same time, in 1958, a South-east Asia research group from Kyoto University received a grant from the Ford Foundation and became the Southeast Asia Research Center [Tōnan Aja Kenkyū Senta], the second such center in Japan to adopt the Area Studies approach in studying this region.¹³⁰ The center's objective was to "strengthen cooperation between developed countries of the Pacific rim and other nations in order to increase the pool of aid to underdeveloped regions," which in the context of the time can be translated as a policy for the containment of communism.¹³¹

Thus, 1958 was a turning point for Japanese scholarship on Asia and a new beginning for contemporary scholarship on Southeast Asia with, on the one hand, the addition of this discipline to East Asian Studies, and, on the other hand, the creation of structures and funding for specific research projects. The Synthetic Study of Socioeconomic Structures in Asian Areas, financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was the first large-scale program devoted to Southeast Asia.¹³² Between 1958 and 1962, sixty million yen were spent on books and equipment distributed to twenty-five institutions specializing in different academic fields.

Prime Minister Kishi Nobusuke, who led the government from 1957 to 1960, was the main political partisan of the rebirth of contemporary Japanese scholarship on Asia. He saw the development of relations with Southeast Asian nations as a crucial form of assistance to the US containment policy. He also firmly believed that Japan could play the role of a political and economic leader in the region.¹³³ Relations between Japan and Southeast Asia were to be re-established through the payment of war reparations as well as development aid. In 1958, a MITI white paper defined the two main objectives of economic cooperation with Southeast Asia: to create stable markets for Japanese products, and to insure a supply of natural resources.

The success of such a policy depended on a better understanding of the countries in the region. Hence, the governments that followed Kishi's premiership adopted a policy of promoting research on contemporary Asia, one facet of which was to support scholarship based on the concept of *chiiki kenkyū*. Although on the surface this appears to be a translation of American-style Area Studies, in fact *chiiki kenkyū* bore a considerable resemblance to Japanese research on Asia prior to 1945.¹³⁴ Despite its aura of novelty and declarations of good intent, the concept, as defined by the Japanese state, differed very little from aspects of pre-1945 Asian Studies in Japan. *Chiiki kenkyū* was, therefore, part of a continuum.¹³⁵ In both periods the focus was similar: research methods focused on the production of contemporary knowledge that could be applied to further the economic, political, trade, and industrial development of Japan in Asia. This approach to research on Asia was limited to non-academic institutions until the mid 1960s, as was the case before 1945.¹³⁶ Despite the creation of research centers, scholarship on contemporary Vietnam was almost inexistent until the late 1960s, as there were no specialists of Vietnam in any of these centers.

Conclusion

Until the end of the Second World War, research on Vietnam remained on the margins of Asian Studies in Japan, and the production of knowledge was divided among countless categories and numerous institutions. The studies in question did not constitute an academic discipline as such, and depending on the period they addressed, fell under different regions and disciplines. Thus, if the subject was precolonial Vietnam, knowledge was produced within universities in the form of oriental history. This knowledge was, moreover, a peripheral subcategory of Chinese Studies, regardless of its position in the hierarchy of Oriental Studies or its approach to the study of Vietnam. Conversely, in works on contemporary Vietnam, that is, French Indochina, knowledge was generally non-historical and non-academic. It belonged to a category outside Oriental Studies, whose subject matter as well as certain aspects of its methodology prefigured the emergence of Vietnam Area Studies in Japan. The accelerated pace of research on contemporary Vietnam during the Pacific War came to a sudden halt in 1945. In contrast, orientalist scholarship in universities, despite a decline due to poor

living conditions in Japan in the immediate postwar years, continued to be pursued and structured, and an important institutional milestone was reached in 1957 with the creation of a position in Southeast Asian History at Tokyo University.

Contemporary Southeast Asian Studies did not revive until 1958 with the support of the Japanese government, and again, only in non-university institutions. However, almost no research on Vietnam was carried out in these institutions until the mid 1960s. The continuity of research on Asia tailored to serve Japan's expansion in the region, albeit in a political and economic form, was highly contested by the generation of scholars known as the "Bandung Generation." However, the system for producing knowledge of contemporary Asia devised by the Japanese state in the late 1930s remained unshaken until the appearance of scholarship by the Vietnam War Generation in the early 1970s and the consequent emergence of Vietnamese Studies.¹³⁷ ■

FRÉDÉRIC ROUSTAN is a PhD student at EHESS, Paris. The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the following people for their supervision, guidance and assistance: Professors Fujiwara Riichirō†, Sakurai Yumio, Furuta Mooto, Tomita Kenji, Shiraiishi Masaya, Goto Fumio, Takeuchi Fusaji, Kawamoto Kunie, Christopher Gosha, and Viviane Lowe.

ABSTRACT

Production of contemporary knowledge on Vietnam in Japan began in the early 1880s. The knowledge produced before 1930s was almost exclusively the result of non-academic and non-institutional research. This article explains how the production of knowledge developed and evolved in the framework of two distinct geographical concepts that also defined the two worlds in which Japanese knowledge of Asia was produced. I attempt to understand how a particular area of research was structured in relation to institutions, research methodologies, and the various actors who helped shape Vietnamese Studies in the context of Japanese expansion in Asia.

KEYWORDS: *Vietnamese Studies, Japan, Oriental Studies, South Pacific Studies, Knowledge Production*

Notes

1. See Laurent Dartigues, *Les représentations françaises du monde social vietnamien à travers les textes savants 1860–1940* [The French Representation of the Vietnamese Social World 1860–1940 Through Erudite Documents] (doctoral thesis, EHESS Marseille, 2001); and Pierre Singaravelou, *L'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient (1898–1956), ou l'institution des marges* [French School of the Far East, The Institution of The Margin] (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1999).
2. Furuta Motoo 古田元夫, "Nihon ni okeru Betonamu kenkyū" 日本におけるベトナム研究 [Vietnamese Studies in Japan], in *Nihon Betonamu kankei o man-abuhito no tameni* 日本・ベトナム関係を学ぶ人のために [For Students of Japan-Vietnam Relations], ed. Kimura Hiroshi 木村宏, Guen Zui Chin グエン・ズイ・ズン, and Furuta Motoo 古田元夫 (Tokyo: Sekai Shisōsha 世界思想社, 2001), 227–240 and 227–228. This idea has been repeated a number of times, including in France. See Guy Faure and Laurent Schwab, *Japon–Vietnam, histoire d'une relation sous influence* [Japan–Vietnam, History of a Relationship Under Influences] (Paris: Les Indes Savantes, 2004), 103.
3. The number he quotes is based on the number of registered members in the research association he co-founded several years earlier.
4. It began with the annexation of the independent kingdom of Ryūkyū Islands.
5. In addition to the bibliography published at regular intervals in the above-quoted journal, readers are referred to the following articles (only articles in Western languages are included; they appear in chronological order by date of publication). See Wada Hisanori, "Development of Japanese Studies in Southeast Asian history," *Acta Asiatica: Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* 18 (March 1970): 95–119; Takada Yoko, "Vietnamese Studies in Japan," *Asian Research Trends* 1 (1991): 48–65; Furuta Motoo, "Japanese Research on Vietnam," *Social Science Japan* 8 (January 1997): 18–19; Shimao Minoru and Sakurai Yumio, "Vietnamese Studies in Japan, 1975–1996," *Acta Asiatica* 76: (January 1999): 81–105; Shiraishi Masaya, "A Short Essay on Scientific Exchanges between Japan and Southeast Asia," *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 1 (2000): 97–106.
6. Starting with the pioneering works of Hikita Toshiaki 引田利章, *Annan shi* 安南史 [History of Annam] (Tokyo: Rikugunbunko 陸軍文庫, 1881).
7. For more information on this topic see for instance Carol Gluck, *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); W. G. Beasley, *The Meiji Restoration* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972); and Lionel Babicz, *Le Japon face à la Corée à l'époque Meiji* [Japan Faces Korea in the Meiji Era] (Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2002).
8. Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient, Rendering Past into History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 47–50.

9. This was based on the model of German historical science. See Tanaka, *Japan's Orient*, 11–15.
10. See Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, *Shinashisō to Nihon* シナ思想と日本 [Chinese Thought and Japan] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1938), 112.
11. Hashikawa Bunso, “Japanese Perspectives on Asia: From Dissociation to Co-prosperity,” in *The Chinese and the Japanese Essays in Political and Cultural Interactions*, ed. Iriye Akira (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 328–355. Fukuzawa Yukichi's 福沢諭吉 “Separation from Asia” [Datsua-ron 脱亞論] remains bound by a Western definition of the region. *Tōyōgaku* was supposed to take into account a certain cultural relativism.
12. Research on Japan falls under this category.
13. Shiratori and Ichimura were active from 1904 to 1925. See Goi Nahohiro 五井直弘, *Kindai Nihon to Tōyō shigaku* 近代日本と東洋史学 [Modern Japan and Studies of Oriental History] (Tokyo, Aoki Shoten 青木書店, 1976), 11–123; Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎, *Tōyōgaku no sōshishatachi* 東洋学の創始者たち [Founders of Oriental Studies] (Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社, 1976), 15–70; and Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, “Shiratori hakase shōden 白鳥博士詳伝” [A Brief Biography of Dr. Shiratori], *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋学報 [Oriental Studies Bulletin] 29, no. 3–4 (January 1944), 325–387. See also Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu 東京大学文学部 [The Arts Faculty of Tokyo University], *Tōkyō Daigaku 100 nen shi: Bukyoku shi 1, bungakubu* 東京大学100年史: 部局史1、文学部 [100 Years of Tokyo University: History of the Arts Faculty, 1] (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大学出版会, 1986), 216–234. Kyōto Teikoku Daigaku 京都帝国大学 [Kyoto Imperial University], or Kyodai, was founded in 1906. Naito developed the concept of *shinagaku* シナ学 [studies on China] which was similar to *tōyōgaku* [Oriental Studies]. “Shina シナ,” meaning China, was used from 1868 to 1945 in opposition to “Chūgoku 中国,” which means “Middle Kingdom.” The notion of Chūgoku implied a center/periphery relationship between China and Japan that Oriental Studies scholars rejected. Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝国大学, or Todai, is the Japanese name for Tokyo Imperial University. I subsequently refer to it as Todai.
14. This generation is represented for instance by the Korea specialist Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 (1873–1962), a student of Shiratori and later a professor in the same history institute. Those specialized countries were essentially China, Korea and Manchuria.
15. Maeda Yoichi and Ikuta Shigeru, “Trends of Cultural Studies in Japan,” *East Asian Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1–4 (1977), 89–100 (92).
16. *Ibid.*
17. The close relationship between the two institutions becomes abundantly clear when one compares the names of the researchers listed in Iwai Hirosato 岩井

- 大慧, *Tōyōbunko 15 nen shi* 東洋文庫十五年史 [The Oriental Library, 15 Years of History] (Tokyo: Tōyōbunko 東洋文庫, 1939), 145–167, and the professors and lecturers in Oriental history at Todai listed in *Tōkyō teikoku daigaku gaku-jutsu daikan, sōsetsu-bungakubu* 東京帝国大学学術大巻、総説・文学部 [Tokyo Imperial University Scientific Compendium General Remarks–Faculty of Arts] (Tokyo: Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝国大学, 1942), 286–308. Interview with Prof. Sakurai Yumio, December 6, 2006, Tokyo.
18. South Manchuria Railway Company Research Center [Minami-Manshū Tetsudō Kabushiki-Gaisha Kenkyūjo 南満州鉄道株式会社研究所].
 19. The South Manchuria Railway Company [Minami-Manshū Tetsudō Kabushiki-Gaisha 南満州鉄道株式会社].
 20. Ramon H. Myers, “Japanese Imperialism in Manchuria: The South Manchuria Railway Company, 1906–1933,” in *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895–1937*, ed. Peter Duus (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 101–132; John Young, *The Research Activities of the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1907–1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 3–34.
 21. Douglas R. Reynolds, “Training Young China Hands: Tōa Dōbun Shoin and its Precursors, 1886–1945,” in Duus ed., *The Japanese Informal Empire in China*, 210–271; Ōmori Chikako 大森千加子, “Tōa Dōbunkai to Tōa Dōbun Shoin 東亜同文会と東亜同文書院” [East Asia Common Culture Society and East Asia Common Culture Academy], *Ajia Keizai* アジア経済 [The Economy of Asia] 18, no. 6 (June 1978): 76–92. This article appeared at monthly intervals until 1982. The name of this society can be translated as East Asian Common Culture Society.
 22. That is, the period before colonization for colonized countries and before the unequal treaties in the case of China.
 23. Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient*, 231–253.
 24. Oguma Eiji 小熊英二, *Tan’itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen: nihonjin no jigazō no keifu* 単一民族神話の起源: 「日本人」の自画像の系譜 [The Origins of the Myth of National Unity: A Genealogy of Japanese Self-Representations] (Tokyo: Shinyōsha 新曜社, 1995), 272–279.
 25. See Andrew E. Barshays, *The Social Sciences in Modern Japan, the Marxian and Modernist Traditions*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 53–59; Peter Duus, “Socialism, Liberalism, and Marxism, 1901–1931,” in *Modern Japanese Thought*, ed. Bob Tadashi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 147–206; and Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient*, 253–262, especially 253. In 1934 Hirano Yoshitarō, a Marxist theoretician, divided Oriental Studies into two categories: so-called scientific studies, produced by Marxists, and imperialist studies (Shiratori’s dichotomy belonged to the latter category, as did its creator and his followers).

26. For more on militarism in Japan during this period, see Jean-Jacques Tschudin and Claude Hamon, eds., *La société japonaise devant la montée du militarisme: Culture populaire et contrôle social dans les années 1930* [Japanese Society and The Rise of Militarism: Popular Culture and Social Control in The 1930s] (Arles: Editions Philippe Picquier, 2007).
27. Tsurumi Shunsuke, *An Intellectual History of Wartime Japan, 1931–1945* (New York: KPI, 1986), 11–13. I refer here to the concept of *tenkō* 転校 [conversion] as defined by Tsurumi.
28. See Tanaka, *Japan's Orient*, 57; John Young, *The Research Activities*, 32.
29. Shimizu Hajime, “Southeast Asia as a Regional Concept in Modern Japan: An Analysis of Geography Textbooks,” in *The Japanese Colonial Southeast Asia*, eds. Shiraishi Saya and Shiraishi Takashi (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 21–61 (29).
30. For more see the pioneering work of Yano Tōru 矢野暢, “*Nanshin*” no keifu [南進] の系譜 [The Origins of The Southern Expansion] (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論者, 1975). The terms “Nankai 南海” [South Seas] or “Nanpō 南方” [Southern Region] were also in common use at the time.
31. Shimizu Hajime, “Southeast Asia as a Regional Concept,” 31.
32. This doctrine was specified in the Southward-Advancement Policy [Nanshin seisaku 南進政策]. The colonial governments of Taiwan and Korea expressed early interest in the region.
33. With variations such as Nanpōkenkyū 南方研究 [Southern Region Studies] and Nankaikenkyū 南海研究 [South Seas Studies].
34. Fustuin 仏印 is a contraction of Futsuryōindochina 仏領印度支那, or French Indochina. See Tanaka, *Japan's Orient*, 57; John Young, *The Research Activities*, 32.
35. Roughly translated, *karayuki san* means “person going to China.” They accounted for 80% of the Japanese population of Indochina before 1920. Japanese male residents were employed mainly as brothel-keepers, hairdressers, shopkeepers, photographers, or ran hotels, cafés and restaurants. From the time of Japan's invasion of Formosa, the French authorities suspected the Japanese population of spying, but apart from a few information-gathering missions by military personnel, the first substantiated cases of spying by Japanese intelligence agents occurred only in the 1930s. This question merits development into an article, if only to address the concept of espionage. See Kashiwagi Takuji 柏木卓司, “Betonamu no karayuki san ベトナムのからゆきさん” [The Karayuki-san of Vietnam], *Rekishi to Jinbutsu 歴史と人物* [History and People] 9, no. 10 (1979), 208–215; Renseignements sur les Japonais de passage au Tonkin, 1904–1905, Box No. 65430, Gouvernement Général de l'Indochine (GGI), Centre des Archives d'Outre-Mer (CAOM); Surveillance des étrangers,

- 1899–1900, Box No. 07668, GGI, CAOM; Surveillance des Asiatiques, 1908–1935, Box No. 7029, Résidence Supérieure du Tonkin Nouveau Fonds (RSTNF), CAOM; Surveillance des Japonais, état nominatif des Japonais résidents au Tonkin, 1905, Box No. 55231, Résidence Supérieure du Tonkin Ancien Fonds (RSTAF). See also Frédéric Roustan, “Français, Japonais et société coloniale du Tonkin: exemple des représentations coloniales,” [French, Japanese and Tonkin Colonial Society: An Example of Colonial Representations] *French Colonial History* 6 (2005): 179–204.
36. Gaimushō no bu Saigon Futsu-han to Annan Seifu no aida kinji fuon no keikyō zai Honkon Ando ryōji yori tsūshin no ken, Meiji jūgo nen san getsu nijūshichi niche 外務省之部 西貢仏藩ト安南政府ノ間近時不穩ノ形況在香港安藤領事ヨリ通信ノ件、明治十五年三月二十七日 第一局 主任属 掛参議 書記官 別紙外務省上申西貢仏藩ト安南政府ノ間近時不穩ノ形況在香港安藤領事ヨリノ通信供高覽侯也 四月二十四日, File No. Ao7061171700, Japan Center for Asian Historical Records (JACAR); Sanbō honbu fukukan ken rikugun daigakkō kyōkan rikugun kōhei shōsa Uehara Yūsaku hoka ichimei Shamu Annan chihō e sashitsukawasaru no ken, rikugundaijin hakushaku Ōyama Iwao, Meiji nijūroku nen shichi-gatsu, nijūichi niche 参謀本部副官兼陸軍大学校教官陸軍工兵少佐上原勇作外一名暹羅安南地方へ被差遣ノ件、陸軍大臣伯爵 大山巖 | | 陸軍大臣伯爵大山巖明治26年7月21日, File No. Ao4010006900, JACAR; Consulat du Japon, 1897–1918, Box No. Bo4 2002 (1), Ministère des Colonies Nouveau Fonds (SOMNF), CAOM. 1897 also coincides with the publication of a Japanese translation of J.L. de Lanessan’s *Indochine Française* [French Indochina] by a government department. See also Do Ranessan ド・ラネツソン, *Futsuryō Indochina takushokushi* 佛領印度支那拓殖誌 [Notes on Colonial Expansion in French Indochina] (Tokyo: Takushokumu Daijin Kanbō Bunka 拓殖務大臣官房文書課, 1897); and the original edition of J.L. de Lanessan, *L’Indochine Française* [French Indochina] (Paris: Alcan, 1885).
37. The Japanese pronunciation of Annam is “Annan 安南.” See Hikita Toshiaki 引田利章, *Annan shi*; Idem., *Futsu-An kankei shimatsu* 仏安關係始末 [Facts About Franco-Vietnamese Relations] (Tokyo: Rikugun Bunko 陸軍文庫, 1888). On the translations, see Takada Yōko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” 44; and Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies,” 95–119.
38. Given their small numbers in Indochina, the topic is generally more developed for other countries, such as Singapore, the Dutch East Indies and the Philippines. See for instance the following examples: Kajiwara Yasuto 梶原保人, *Tonan yūki* 閩南遊記 [Travels to the South] (Taiwan: Kajiwara Yasuto, 1913), 211–215; Tsurumi Yūsuke 鶴見祐輔, *Nan’yō Yūki* 南洋遊記 [Travels in the South Seas] (Tokyo: Dainippon Yūbenkai 大日本雄辯會, 1917), 349–464; and

- Takekoshi Yosaburō 竹越與三郎, *Nangoku ki* 南国記 [Lands of the South] (Tokyo: Niyūsha 二酉社, 1910), 261–300.
39. Taiwan, in particular.
40. Maeda Hōjirō 前田宝治郎, *Futsuryō Indochina* 仏領印度支那 [French Indochina] (Tokyo: Nanpōkenkyūkai 南方研究会, 1924).
41. Kameyama Tetsuzō 亀山哲三, *Nanyōgakuin: senjika Betonamu ni tsukurareta gaichikō* 南洋学院: 戦時下ベトナムに作られた外地校 [The South Seas Institute: The Foreign-based School Established in Vietnam During the War] (Tokyo: Fuyōshobōshuppan 芙蓉書房出版, 1996), 12–13.
42. Yano Tōru, “*Nanshin*” *no keifu*, 76.
43. Joyce C. Lebra, *Japanese-Trained Armies in Southeast Asia* (Singapore: Heinemann Educational Books, 1977), 40.
44. Yano Tōru, “*Nanshin*” *no keifu*, 76–78. Interview with M. Yamamoto, June 21, 2007, Osaka. With the intention of moving to Indonesia, he followed a short course at the Nan'yō Kyōkai 南洋協会 in Tokyo, and then, through the society, was hired by Saitō Urushi 齊藤漆, an Osaka company trading in lacquerware, and sent to work in their Hà Nội office in 1943.
45. Published between 1916 and 1945, the journal was renamed *Nan'yō Kyōkai Zasshi* 南洋協会雑誌 [South Seas Association Journal] in 1919, and *Nan'yō* 南洋 [South Pacific] in 1925.
46. The first article was published in 1919 by Yokoyama Masanaga 横山正脩 and in 1924 by Matsushita Mitsuhiro 松下光広. Yokoyama published in the 1920s five books in Japanese related to Indochina and economic issues, using a different reading of his name, Yokoyama Seishū 横山正脩.
47. Renseignement sur les Japonais au Tonkin, 1940, Box No. 613, RSTNE, CAOM; Japonais-Vietminh, 1946–1948, Box No. 57, File No. 198, Haut Commissariat de l'Indochine (HCI), CAOM; Affaires Japonaises, 1940–1945, Box No. 121, File No. 375, HCI, CAOM. See Pierre Brocheux, Paul Isoart, and Shiraishi Masaya, *L'Indochine française 1940–1945, La présence japonaise en Indochine 1940–1945* [French Indochina 1940–1945, The Japanese Presence in Indochina 1940–1945] (Nice: Université de Droit, 1982), 217–222. See also Philippe Franchini, *Saigon 1925–1945, Autrement* [Differently] 17, (September 1992): 76 and 228; Kitano Norio 北野典夫, *Amakusa kaigai hatten shi* 天草海外発展史 [History of the Overseas Development of Amakusa] (Fukuoka: Ashi Shobō 葦書房, 1985), 236–278; Extraits de la presse japonaise, 1917–1918, Box No. 18920, GGI, CAOM; Mission en Indochine de Tamura Katō, Yakoshiro Kinushiro et Seijirō Omura, 1916, Box No. 33306, GGI, CAOM; Kashiwagi Takuji, “Betonamu no karayuki san,” 210. Dainan Kōshi 大南公司 still exists under the name “Nippon Kōei” 日本工営. This company was very active in South Vietnam between 1954 and 1975, where it was responsible for the allocation of Japanese government development aid.

48. Mizutani Otokichi 水谷乙吉, the Mitsubishi Company representative in Hải Phòng and a resident since the 1920s, published around ten books on Indochina in three years beginning in 1940 (many of them translations of works in French).
49. Indicative counting established from the NACSIS Webcat database: http://webcat.nii.ac.jp/webcat_eng.html.
50. Two of the earliest Japanese specialists of Vietnam consider the following to be the first academic studies published on the subject. See Matsumoto Nobuhiro 松本信廣, *Indoshina no minzoku to bunka* 印度支那の民族と文化 [Population and Culture of Indochina] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1942); and Matsumoto Nobuhiro 松本信廣, *Betonamu minzoku shōshi* ベトナム民族小史 [A Brief History of the Vietnamese People] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, 1969). Interview with Prof. Fujiwara Riichirō 藤原利一郎, February 4, 2006, Kyoto; and interview with Prof. Kawamoto Kunie 川本邦衛, January 10, 2006, Tokyo. Prof. Fujiwara died in December 2008. He was a member of the first generation of Japanese scholars of Vietnamese history along with Prof. Matsumoto and Prof. Yamamoto.
51. Ide Asaki 井出浅亀, *Futsuin kenkyū: Shigen no ōkoku to Annan teikoku* 仏印研究: 資源の王國と安南帝國 [French Indochina Studies: Annam Empire and the Kingdom of Resources] (Tokyo: Kōkoku Seinen Kyōiku Kyōkai 皇国青年教育協会, 1941).
52. Taihei'yōkyōkai Hen 太平洋協会編 [The Pacific Association] ed., *Futsuryō-indosina: Seiji, keizai* 領印度支那: 政治・経済 [French Indochina: Politics and Economy] (Tokyo: Kawade Shobō 河出書房, 1940).
53. Reynolds, "Training Young China Hands," 241–247.
54. The group was usually around ten students. See Reynolds, "Training Young China Hands," 242.
55. This data collection made use of Asian language skills.
56. Tsuchiya Kenji was an Indonesia specialist. See Tsuchiya Kenji 土屋健治, "Shisō to kotoba: Chiiki kenkyū no sonritsu konkyo 思想の言葉: 地域研究の存立根拠" [Ideas and Words: the Foundation of Area Studies], *Shisō* 思想 [Ideas] 834, no. 12 (December 1993): 1–3.
57. Yamaguchi Eiko 山口英子, "Tōa dōbun shoin-sei no Futsuryō Indochina chōsa ryokō 東亜同文書院生の仏領印度支那調査旅行" [Research Trips by the East Asia Common Culture Academy Students in French Indochina], *Shokuminchi Bunka Kenkyū* 植民地文化研究 [Research on Colonial Culture] 5 (2006): 230–235. The presence of four of these students in Hà Nội in 1939 is mentioned in the following: see *Activités commerciales japonaises, correspondances diverses, 1939*, Box No. 7059, RSTNF, CAOM. One of the theses dealing in part with French Indochina was republished; Fujita Yoshihasa 藤田佳久,

Tōa dōbun shoin, Chūgoku chōsa ryōko kiroku, Chūgoku o koete 東亜同文書院・中国調査旅行記録: 中国を越えて [East Asia Common Culture Academy, Notes on Travels in China, Beyond China] (Tokyo: Daimeitō 大明堂, 1998), 225–406.

58. I hope to be able to develop this remark into a more thorough analysis of the information provided by these sources, which I have not yet had a chance to fully exploit as I am still in the process of studying them.
59. See Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies in Southeast Asian history,” *Acta Asiatica* 18 (1970): 95–119 (107).
60. He published on this topic in 1929 and every year after 1934 in the *Annual Research Bulletin of the Department of Historical Studies*. Some articles discuss Vietnam and Cambodia. He became a lecturer in 1935 and a professor the following year. See *Taihoku teikoku daigaku shigakuka kenkyū nenpō* 台北帝国大学史学科学研究年報 [Annual Research Bulletin of the Department of Historical Studies of the Imperial University of Taihoku] vols. 2 and 3 (Taihoku: Imperial University of Taihoku, 1935 and 1936).
61. Shimizu Hajime, “Southeast Asia as a Regional Concept in Modern Japan: An Analysis of Geography Textbooks,” *The Japanese Colonial Southeast Asia*, eds. Shirai-shi Saya and Shirai-shi Takashi (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 53.
62. Lin Szeming 林思敏, *Kindai Nihon no nanshin seisaku—Taiwan sōtokufu o chūshin ni shite* 近代日本の南進政策—台湾総督府を中心にして [Japan’s Southern Expansionism – Focus on the Government of Taiwan] (doctoral thesis, Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku 東京外国語大学, 2005), 55–71. The Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs published practical information on Indochina aimed at potential migrants. For the principal publication of this kind, see Gaimushō Tsūshōkyoku 外務省通商局, *Imin chōsa hōkoku* 移民調査報告 [Research Report for Emigration] vol. 4 (Tokyo: Gaimushō Tsūshōkyoku 外務省通商局, 1910), as well as a number of booklets. Every year, the Takumushō 拓務省—a ministry created in 1925 to regulate and control Japanese emigration and colonization (it was incorporated into the Ministry of Greater Asia in 1942)—published booklets that featured Indochina among other countries of the South Pacific, similar to the Gaimushō booklets. See Tokumushō Takumukyoku 拓務省拓務局 [Office of the Ministry of Colonies and Expansion], *Nanyō jijō kōgai* 南洋事情梗概 [A Summary on the Situation in the South Pacific] (Tokyo: Tokumushō Takumukyoku 拓務省拓務局, 1933). These books consist of reports of about fifty pages published in a collection entitled *Minami Shina oyobi Nan’yō chōsa* 南支那及び南洋調査 [Survey of South China and The South Pacific], sometimes in the form of a directory (of Japanese-owned plantations in Southeast Asia, for instance), statistical information, reports on the Japanese presence in Southeast Asia, etc. In 1929, the section also began

- publishing the *Nan'yō Nenkan* 南洋年間 [South Pacific Yearbook], an annual compendium of knowledge on Southeast Asia.
63. The works address not only Indochina but also other countries of Southeast Asia.
 64. Between 1920 and 1940, there were no more than 350 Japanese residents in Indochina. See Kashiwagi Takuji, “Senzenki futsuryō Indoshina ni okeru shinshutsu no keitai 戦前期仏領印度支那における進出の形態” [Forms of Japanese Penetration in French Indochina before the Second World War], *Ajia Keizai* アジア経済 [The Economy of Asia] 31, no. 339 (March 1990): 78–97 (87).
 65. Known as *Annan kenkyū* 安南研究, or Annam research.
 66. See Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies,” 95, for a list of journals that published bibliographies of historical works on Southeast Asia. Upon closer examination of these journals, I noticed that studies on the South Pacific always appear under the heading *Tōyōshi* [Tōyōshi kenkyū *Bunken Ruimoku* 東洋史研究文献類目 [List of Documents Related to Historical Studies of the Orient]. See Tōhōbunka Gakuin Kyoto Kenkyūjo 東方文化學院京都研究所 [Kyoto Research Institute for Oriental Culture] (1934–1955), *Tōyōshi ronbun yōmoku: hōbun Rekishigaku kankei shozasshi* 東洋史論文要目: 邦文歴史學關係諸雜誌 [Lexicon of Theses on the History of the Orient in Various History Journals in Japan], Ōtsuka Shigakkai Kōshi Bukai 大塚史学会高師部会 [Section of the Teacher Training School of the Ōtsuka Historical Research Association] (Tokyo: Ōtsuka Shigakkai Kōshi Bukai 大塚史学会高師部会, 1936). In addition to this list, I consulted the journal of the Oriental Studies Society, *Tōyō Gakuhō*. The result is the same.
 67. *Rekishi Kyōiku* 歴史教育 [Teaching History] 9, no. 7 (July 1932): 572–610, focused on the evolution of historical research in Japan since the Meiji period. The article on the South Pacific (pages 572–610, and 582 for Vietnam) appears in a chapter devoted to *tōyōgakushi* 東洋学史 [Oriental Studies History]. The same goes for the journal *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* 歴史学研究 [Historical Research]. See “Tōyōshiron 東洋史論” [Studies of Oriental History], *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* 歴史学研究 10, no. 4 (1940): 52–99 (the South Pacific is mentioned on pages 82–85). The same goes for the journal’s volume nos. 11 and 12, no. 4 (1941): 91–96; no. 5 (1942): 96–99; and 13, no. 6–7 (1943): 115–119. After 1942, the term “Nan’yō” was replaced by “Minami Ajia 南亜細亞” [South Asia]. This also occurs in the journal *Shigaku Zasshi* 史学雑誌 [History Journal]. Prof. Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎 presents his research on Vietnam in a section of *Shigakkai* 史学会 [Historical Society], called “Tōyōshi 東洋史” [Oriental History].
 68. The various published articles were collected in Sugimoto Naojirō 杉本直治郎, *Tōnanajiashi kenkyū* 東南アジア史研究 [Southeast Asian Historical Studies] (Tokyo: Gannandō Shoten 巖南堂書店, [1956] 1968).

69. He belonged to the third generation of Japanese orientalist trained at Todai, sometimes referred to as the “Baronet Generation” as many of its prominent members were scions of the nobility. Interview with Prof. Sakurai Yumio 桜井由躬雄, December 6, 2006, Tokyo.
70. Even though they published studies on Southeast Asia. See Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies,” 102–103.
71. See Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu, *Tōkyō Daigaku 100 nen shi*, 216–234. In the meantime he had become the head of the Oriental History Department at Todai.
72. Yamamoto Tatsuō 山本達郎, “Annan Reichō no koninhō 安南黎朝の婚姻法” [Internal Law under the Le Dynasty of Annam], *Tōhō Gakuhō* 8, no. 72 (1938): 247–318.
73. He had occupied this position since 1939. See Yamamoto Tatsuō 山本達郎, *Annanshi kenkyū* 安南史研究 [Studies on the History of Annam] (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社, 1950), 3. This research center was created by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Coedès’s sympathies towards the Japanese seem to have extended beyond relations of an academic nature. See Pierre Singaravelou, *L’Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient ou l’institution des marges (1898–1956)* [French School of the Far East, The Institution of The Margin] (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1999), 203.
74. These were re-edited as a volume in 1950. This book is an important reference for Vietnamese Studies in Japan, particularly because of its methodology (a multi-pronged approach encompassing history, anthropology and archeology, with a very critical approach to the Chinese sources used). See Yamamoto Tatsuō, *Annanshi kenkyū*.
75. An article about the EFEO in the famous history journal *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* 歴史学研究 also expresses deep respect for the work of the French institution. See Komura Chisei 小村知性, “Hanoi Furansu kyokutō gakuin no kōkogaku kōsaku 河内仏蘭西極東学院の考古学工作” [Archeological Research by the Ecole Française d’Extrême Orient in Hà Nội] *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* 2 (1935): 65–71. See also Yamamoto Tatsuō 山本達郎, *Annanshi kenkyū*, 2. This theme of the EFEO’s influence on knowledge production on Vietnam is developed in Laurent Dartigues, *Les représentations françaises du monde social vietnamien à travers les textes savants 1860–1940* [The French Representation of the Vietnamese Social World 1860–1940 Through Erudite Documents] (doctoral thesis, EHESS Marseille, 2001).
76. *Congrès international des études d’Extrême-Orient* [International Far Eastern Studies Conference], *Premier congrès international des études d’Extrême-Orient, Hanoi (1902): compte rendu analytique des séances* [First International Congress of Far Eastern Studies, Hà Nội (1902): Summary Records of Meet-

ings] (Hà Nội: F. H. Schneider, 1903), 10–13 and 131–134. The scholars in question were professors Fujishima 藤島 of the Imperial Oriental Studies Society [Teikoku Tōyōgakkai 帝国東洋学会], Nanjō Bunyū 南条文雄 of the same society, and Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, a scholar of Indian philosophy at Todai. EFEO supported these scholars' Chinese-Sanskrit dictionary project, namely by offering to publish it in French. Furthermore, these same academics took advantage of their stay in Indochina to do research and the following year they co-published a collection of articles consisting of a general presentation of the French colony and a bibliography of works on Indochina and trade relations between China, Japan, and Annam. See Nanjō Bunyū 南条文雄 and Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, *Futsuryō Indoshina* 仏領印度支那 [French Indochina] (Tokyo: Bunmeidō 文明堂, 1903). Furthermore, writings by members of the EFEO such as Pelliot were often translated in Japanese history journals (an obituary of Pelliot appears in the journal *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* in June 1935: 64), but not until the generation of Prof. Yamamoto did these exchanges concern Vietnam.

77. For more on this topic, see the special issue of *Shigaku* 史学 published on the occasion of his retirement. See Takeda 竹田, “Jyo 序” [Preface], *Shigaku* 史学 [History Studies] 39, no. 2–3 (1967): 1–2.
78. According to Prof. Fujiwara Riichirō 藤原利一郎, Prof. Matsumoto used his French language skills to translate works published by the EFEO. Interviews with Prof. Fujiwara Riichirō, February 4, 2006, Kyoto.
79. Kawamoto Kunie 川本邦衛, “Foreword and Remarks” in *Dai Nam Thuc Luc chimei sakuin ichi* 大南寔録地名索引一 [Index of Place Names in the *Annals of Đai Nam*] vol. 1 (Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gogaku Kenkyūjo 慶應義塾大学言語文化学研究所 [Keio University Language Studies Institute], 2002), xi–xii. Matsumoto received the copies in 1935 and deposited them in various libraries in Japan. He began to re-edit them at Keio University in 1961.
80. Paul Boudet and Rémi Bourgeois, *Bibliographie de l'Indochine Française 1931–1935* [Bibliography of French Indochina, 1931–1935] (Hà Nội: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1943), 268.
81. Tomita Kenji 冨田健次, “Nihon ni okeru Betonamugo kyōiku/kenkyū 日本におけるベトナム語教育・研究” [Vietnamese Language Teaching and Research in Japan], in *Waga kuni ni okeru gaikokugo kyōiku, kenkyū no shiteki kōsatsu* わが国における外国語研究・教育の史的考察 [Historical Considerations on Foreign Language Teaching and Research in Japan], ed. Yamaguchi Keishirō 山口慶四郎 (Osaka: Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku 大阪外国語大学, 1989), 56–57.
82. There was at the time no real distinction between public centers or private institutions as both were controlled by the Japanese army. See John Young,

- The Research Activities of the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1907–1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 41, 597–606; Takada Yoko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” *Asian Research Trends* 1 (1991): 48–65 (49); and Sakamoto Tokumatsu 坂本徳松, “Indoshina kenkyū nyūmon インドシナ研究入門” [Introduction to Research on Indochina], *Ajia Afurika kenkyū nyūmon* [Introduction to Research on Asia and Africa], ed. Ajia Afurika Kenkyū Jo アジア・アフリカ研究所 [Institute of Asian-African Studies] (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten 青木書店, 1965), 178.
83. This center was also a Mantetsu research center. Established in 1908, it became independent of Mantetsu in 1929 but was reincorporated in 1939. For further research on the activities of this research center and its publications, see Hara Kakuten 原覚天, *Gendai Ajia kenkyū seiritsu shiron: Mantetsu chōsabu, Tōa kenkyūjo, IPR no kenkyū* 現代アジア研究成立史論—満鉄調査部・東亜研究所・IPRの研究 [Historical Essay on the Formation of Contemporary Asian Studies: Research Carried out by the Mantetsu Chōsabu, Tōa Kenkyūjo, IPR] (Tokyo: Keisōshobō 勁草書房, 1984). The Pacific Association published, for instance, a manual on the colony’s economy and political system, which was republished seven times in two years. See Taiheiyō Kyōkai 太平洋協会, *Futsuryō Indoshina: Seiji • Keizai* 仏領印度支那, 政治・経済 [French Indochina: Politics and Economy] (Tokyo: Kawade Shobō 河出書房, 1940).
 84. See Tachikawa Kyoichi, “Independence Movements In Vietnam and Japan during WWII,” in *NIDS Security Reports* no. 2, March 2001, 101.
 85. Shiraishi Masaya, “A Short Essay on Scientific Exchanges between Japan and Southeast Asia,” *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 1 (2000): 97–106 (100).
 86. Tomita Kenji, “Nihon ni okeru Betonamugo kyōiku/kenkyū,” 56. Kuroki Yoshinori 黒木義典, *Betonamugo nyūmon* ベトナム語入門 [Introduction to the Vietnamese Language] (Tokyo: Kōnan Shoin 江南書院, 1958). This work is one of the first Vietnamese language manuals written by an academic linguist.
 87. Note that Nan’yōgakuin 南洋学院, the institute created in Sài Gòn by the South Seas Association [Nanyō Kyōkai 南洋協会] in January 1942, produced no research; it was merely a training center offering vocational courses.
 88. Takada Yoko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” 12.
 89. *Ibid.*, 26–33.
 90. A number of these researchers would later become leaders or influential members of the postwar communist and socialist parties (for example, Ritsu Itō 伊藤律 and Hiromi Arisawa 有沢廣巳). Links with the army were very close. For instance, in 1932 Mantetsu created the Economic Research Association [Keizai Kenkyū Kai 経済研究] at the request of the general-in-chief of the Kwantung army.
 91. Takada Yoko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” 28–29.

92. For a detailed list of the people arrested, see *Ibid.*, 29–33. These included, among others, former students of the East Asia Common Culture Academy, who were accused of pacifism. Many died in prison.
93. Indochina was addressed in about twenty theses on contemporary topics such as railroads, electrical power plants, and economic relations with Vietnam. See Takada Yoko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” 15. Established after the beginning of the Pacific War, the South Pacific Research Group brought together research groups from Mantetsu, Tokyo Trade University, Mitsubishi Economic Research Institute and the research department of the Pacific Association on the Economy of East Asia (“Southeast Asia” in the original text). Five topics were defined and distributed among the research groups: the Japanese army; South Asia; Sumatra, Malaysia, and Burma; the Philippines; Java and North Borneo.
94. It would be very interesting to study the links between different types of research and examine the exchange of ideas and researchers between all these institutes. However, I lack the necessary documentation, namely the curriculum of these institutes and the careers of the researchers. I have not yet found documents that would allow a more detailed analysis. Nevertheless, it is possible to affirm that studies of Indochina carried out in these research centers show no scholarly specialization, and that their productions were directed towards large-scale political and economic surveys with significant strategic aspects. There was no doubt of the fact that Indochina was widely seen as belonging to the zone of Japanese southern expansion.
95. Takada Yoko, “Vietnamese Studies in Japan,” 14–15.
96. In 1939, 287 projects were developed. The number rose to over 500 in 1940 followed by 143 in the first half of 1941.
97. Tōkyō Shisa Chōsashitsu 東京支社調査室 [Tokyo Office Bureau], *Futsuryō Indoshina keizai no Nihon keizai ni oyobosu eikyō ni tsuite* 仏領印度支那経済の日本経済に及ぼす影響に着いて [Economic and Trade Relations between French Indochina and Japan] (Tokyo: Mantetsu, 1939); Tōa Keizai Chōsakyoku 東亜経済調査局 [East Asia Economic Research Bureau], *Futsuin seifu no tai Annanjin seisaku* 仏印政府の対安南人政策 [The Policy of the French Government of Indochina Towards the Annamese] (Tokyo: Mantetsu, 1943).
98. This was also the case of the Institute of Ethnology [Minzoku Kenkyūjo 民族研究所] created in 1943. For more on this institute, its methods and research projects in the context of this period, as well as its collaboration and resistance to the war effort, see Nakao Katsumi 中生勝実, *Minzoku kenkyūjo no soshiki to katsudō:sensōchū no Nihon minzoku gaku* 民族研究所の組織と活動: 戦争中の日本民族学 [The Organization and Activities of the Institute of Ethnology:

- Japanese Ethnology during the Second World War], *The Japanese Journal of Ethnology* 62, no. 1 (June 1997): 47–65. For more on the cultural studies, see Minami Ajia Bunka Kenkyūjo 南アジア文化研究所 [South Asian Cultural Studies Institute], “Shohō 所報” [Directions], *Minami Ajia Gakuhō* 南亜細亜学報 [South Asian Studies Bulletin] no. 1 (December 1942): 226–228, and especially 226.
99. Minami Ajia Bunka Kenkyūjo, “Shohō,” 226–228.
 100. See Iwao Seiichi 岩生成一, *Nan'yō nihon machi no kenkyū* 南洋日本町の研究 [Research on Japanese Cities in the South Pacific] (Tokyo: Nan'a Bunka Kenkyūjo 南亞文化研究所, 1940).
 101. For a selective bibliography see Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies,” 103.
 102. See Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎, “Tōnan Ajia shigakkai no kadai 東南アジア史学会の課題” [About the Society for Southeast Asia History], *Tōnan Ajia: Rekishi to Bunka* 東南アジア: 歴史と文化 [Southeast Asia: History and Culture] 1, no. 1 (1971): 5–11.
 103. This was favored by the Franco-Japanese agreement of 1942 on academic exchange, in line with Japan's policy of cultural propaganda within the co-prosperity sphere. See Rapport secret du BCRA sur différentes questions intéressantes l'Indochine, 1943, Box No. 1131, SOMNE, CAOM; and Namba Chizuru, *Occupation, colonization et culture en Indochine, 1940–1945: rivalité et accommodements franco-japonais* [Occupation, Colonization and Culture in Indochina, 1940–1945: Franco-Japanese Rivalry and Accommodations] (doctoral thesis, Université Lumière Lyon 2, 2006), 288–292.
 104. Wada Hisanori, “Development of Japanese Studies, 113.
 105. Interview with Prof. Fujiwara Riichirō 藤原利一郎, February 4, 2006, Kyoto.
 106. Akiho Ichirō 昭穂一郎, “Annan koku to Furansu no dōka seisaku 安南国とフランスの同化政策” [Vietnam and the French Policy of Assimilation], *Tōagaku* 東亜学 [East Asian Studies] 3 (1940): 27–56; and Kagimoto Hiroshi 鍵本博, “Furansu ryōyū zengo no Annan shakai フランス領有前後の安南社会” [Vietnamese Society under French Occupation], *Tōa Keizai Ronsō* 東亜経済論争 [Debates on the Economy of East Asia] 2, no. 4 (December 1942): 844–869.
 107. Before and after the war he published on legal issues and the history of political thought. Some of these works on Vietnam were collected in Ōiwa Makoto 大岩誠, *Minami Ajia minzoku seijiron* 南アジア民族政治論 [Political Essays on the Peoples of South Asia] (Tokyo: Panrikaku 万里閣, 1942).
 108. Prof. Takigawa Yukitori 滝川幸辰, a member of the same law department, was dismissed by the Ministry of Education in 1933 for expressing Marxist and communist views in his lectures on criminal law. All the other members of the department resigned in a show of solidarity.

109. This concept was touched upon earlier. He namely wrote a report on law and administration in Indochina for Mantetsu. See Ōiwa Makoto 大岩誠, *Futsuin gyōsei seido gaisetsu* 仏印行政制度概説 [Treatise on the Administrative System of French Indochina] (Tokyo: Minami Manshū Tetsudō Tōa Keizai Chōsakyoku 南滿洲鉄道東亜經濟調査局, 1943).
110. Ōiwa Makoto 大岩誠, *Annan minzoku undō shi gaisetsu* 安南民族運動史概説 [Outline of the History of the Nationalist Movement in Vietnam] (Tokyo: Guroria Sosaete グロリア・ソサエテ, 1941).
111. The Yên Bái mutiny was a Vietnamese popular uprising that took place on February 9–10, 1930, and namely involved Vietnamese soldiers of the garrison and instigated by the Việt Nam Quốc Dân Đảng [Vietnamese Nationalist Party]. See Ōiwa Makoto 大岩誠, *Annan minzoku undō shi gaisetsu*, 4–5. Given Ōiwa's involvement with the French Communist Party, it seems likely that these young Vietnamese were also communists. Since the book was published in 1941, it obviously provides no detailed information about the political leanings of the young independence activists.
112. During the war he had contacts with Vietnamese independence activists and also met fellow Japanese in Tonkin who supported the movement, such as Yamane Doichi. See the memoir by Uchikawa Ōmi 内川大海, *Shirukurōdo no yume: aru seishun no kiroku* シルクロードの夢: ある青春の記録 [Silk Road Dreams: A Record of Our Youth] (Aki: Uchikawa Ōmi 安芸, 1993). In my opinion, the study of his individual career would help us better understand the contribution of Marxist reserachers to Japanese Vietnamese Studies of the 1930s–1950s.
113. The phrase appears in Kin Ei Ken 金永鍵, *Nichi-futsu-annan-go kaiwa jiten* 日・佛・安南語会話辞典 [Manual of Japanese-French-Annamese Conversation] (Tokyo: Okakura Shobō 岡倉書房, 1942), 231.
114. Along with the scholars of French were also Chinese specialists, of course.
115. Tomita Kenji, “Nihon ni okeru Betonamugo kyōiku/kenkyū,” 56; Kuroki Yoshinori, *Betonamugo nyūmon*. This work is one of the first Vietnamese language manuals written by an academic linguist.
116. Here too, the influence of EFEO was large. The works of these founders were often adaptations of work carried out by the French institute. See Mineya Tōru 三根谷徹, *Etsunan kanjian no kenkyū* 越南漢字音の研究 [A Study of the Pronunciation of Vietnamese Kanji] (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunkō 東洋文庫, 1972), i, ii, and 1–42.
117. Interview with Prof. Kawamoto Kunie, January 10, 2006, Tokyo. When he entered university, Professor Kawamoto wanted to become a novelist. In 1949 Tokyo Foreign Affairs Vocational College became the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies [Tokyo Gaikokugo Daigaku 東京外国語大学].

118. Interview with Prof. Kawamoto Kunie, January 10, 2006, Tokyo. The perception of Vietnam as a peripheral region of China is representative of the first generation of researchers, that of Matsumoto. The second generation, to which Kawamoto belonged, modified this view under the influence of Vietnamese nationalist movements.
119. Anny Wong, "Japan's National Security and Cultivation of ASEAN Elites," in *Japan and South East Asia*, ed. Mendl Wolf (New York: Routledge, 2001), 286–287. This was the first time Japan extended official assistance and not an indemnity to developing countries. The Colombo Plan was started by the countries of the commonwealth in July 1950 following the outbreak of the Korean War to promote economic and social development programs in an effort to contain the spread of communism. Interview with Prof. Kawamoto Kunie, January 10, 2006, Tokyo. In fact, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs already had on its staff a few Vietnamese speakers, such as Inoue Kishisaburo or Kobayashi Keizo.
120. This school was formerly the Osaka School of Foreign Languages [Osaka Gaikokugo Gakkō 大阪外国語学校]. Its name and status changed in 1949 during the reform of Japanese education.
121. Tomita Kenji, "Nihon ni okeru Betonamugo kyōiku/kenkyū," 56.
122. Ministry of Education at Tokyo University of Foreign Languages [*Tokyo Gaikokugo Daigaku Indoshinaka Betonamugo Senkō* 東京外国語大学インドシナ科ベトナム語専攻].
123. Like the Tōyōkyōkai 東洋協会 or Nanyōshigakkai 南洋史学会.
124. Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu, *Tōkyō Daigaku 100 nen shi*, 230–231.
125. Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎, "Hiyō to shōkai, Sedesu shi 'Kyokutō no Indo-ka shita shokoku no kodaishi' 批評と紹介 セデス氏「極東の印度化下諸国の古代史」 [Critique and Presentation of *L'histoire ancienne des Etats hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient* by Coedès], *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋学報 [Oriental Studies Bulletin] 31, no. 3 (1947): 104–117.
126. Takada Yoko, "Vietnamese Studies in Japan," 44.
127. Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎, *Annan Shikenkyū* 安南史研究 [Research on the History of Annam] (Tokyo, Yamakawa Shotensha 山川出版社, 1950).
128. The journal of ECAFE, *Ekafe tsūshin* エカフェ通信 [ECAFE Bulletin], was one of the only journals in Japan to publish research reports on Asia. See Horii Kenzo, "Southeast Asia, the Economy," in *Understanding the Developing World, Thirty Five Years of Area Studies at IDE*, eds. Yamaguchi Hirochi and Sato Hiroshi (Tokyo: IDE, 1996), 59–82, 60.
129. The Asian Political and Economic Studies Society [Ajia Seikei Gakkai アジア政経学会], now known as JAAS, or the Japan Association for Asian Studies [Ajia Keizai Gakkai アジア経済学会], was created in 1953 by Japanese academics.

There is a striking resemblance between the objectives of the latter association and its members with those of the IDE. The association appears to be the academic arm of the IDE.

130. "Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University," *East Asian Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1-4 (1964). 54. The grant was a 350,000 USD grant awarded in 1963. See the Ford Foundation, *Ford Foundation Annual Report*, no. 1, 1963, 48.
131. "News from the Ford Foundation," *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 東南アジア研究 [Southeast Asian Studies] no. 1 (1963): 91.
132. "Present Situation of Asian Studies in Japan," *East Asian Cultural Studies* 1, no. 1-4 (1962): 90.
133. T. Shiraishi, "Japan and Southeast Asia," in *Network Power: Japan and Asia*, dir. P. Katzenstein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 176-178.
134. See Tsuchiya Kenji, "Shisō to Kotoba."
135. This basic definition was refined in individual ways by the centers that applied this approach. For more on the Institute of Developing Economies, see Tōhata Seiichi 東畑精, "100 gō o Kinen shite 百号を記念して" [100th Issue Commemoration], *Ajia Keizai* アジア経済 [Asian Economy] 10, no. 6-7 (1969): 2-5; and Tōhata Seiichi 東畑精, "Sōkan no Ji" 創刊の辞 [Speech for the First Issue], *Ajia Keizai* 1, no. 1 (1961): 4-5. For more on the Center for Southeast Asian Studies in Kyoto, see Motoooka Takeshi 本岡武, "Chiiki kenkyū towa Nanika" 地域研究とは何か [What is Area Studies?], *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 1, no. 1, (1964): 5-19; Motoooka Takeshi 本岡武, "Chiiki kenkyū nitsuite no Hansei 地域研究についての反省" [Reflections on Area Studies], *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 1, no. 4 (1964): 71-81; and Kagimoto Hiroshi, "Senta ni okeru Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū センタにおける東南アジア研究" [Southeast Asian Studies at the Centre], *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 7, no. 2 (1969): 254-269. However, these theoretical differences tended to become less pronounced in practice.
136. On the evolution of Area Studies in universities, see *Survey on the State of Teaching and Research Relating to International and Area Studies in Japanese Universities* (Japan: The International House of Japan, 1958).
137. For an overview of the evolution of historical studies on Vietnam in Japan, see *Tōnan Ajia shi gakkai 40 shūnen kinen jigyō iinkai hen* 東南アジア史学会40周年記念事業委員会編 [Committee for the Commemoration of 40 Years of the Southeast Asian History Society], *Tōnan Ajia shi kenkyū no tenkai* 東南アジア史研究の展開 [The Development of Southeast Asian History in Japan] (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社, 2009).