Preface

Probably few persons who take up this book will need to be persuaded of the importance of Asian studies in college education. Since World War II, they will have witnessed the rising importance of Asia in world politics and recognized the need of our educated citizens for a better grasp of the forces involved. Or they will at least have felt discomfort in classroom or parlor conversation when it touched on areas of Asian experience, unfamiliar to them, which have suddenly become common points of reference in such fields as economic development, psychoanalysis, the study of religion, literature, and so on. Indeed, so rapidly has our consciousness developed of the need for greater understanding of Asia, and so widespread the effort to meet it—through all levels of education, through state and federal programs, through international exchange, through the intense competition among publishers for Asian materials—that the problem is no longer how to stimulate action in favor of Asian studies, but rather how to guide these burgeoning efforts in the right direction.

The papers contained here, and presented earlier to a conference at Columbia University of two hundred American college teachers, represent the thinking on this question both of Asian specialists and of scholars eminent in various disciplines (but not "area" specialists) who appreciate the significance of Asia to their own discipline. They have been asked to explain that significance particularly in terms of education in the liberal arts for undergraduates who may not take up Asian studies as a career, and yet should acquire, before they leave college, some basic familiarity with how Asian peoples have lived and what they have lived for.

The underlying assumption of such a discussion is that Asia, once a specialized subject of "area study," has now entered the sphere of general education. To some persons, this latter term may suggest catch-all courses and an almost unlimited license to teach, preach, or philosophize about human life. To us, however, the requirements of general education are certainly no less strict than other forms of instruction or learning. In fact, to distill what is most essential in human terms from the mass of accumulated knowledge of Asia imposes heavy limitations and a severe discipline on the instructor. To help him in this demanding task of selection and evaluation, the judgment of specialists responsive to this great challenge to contemporary education can be invaluable.

Another condition which we have had to accept for purposes of this discussion is the impracticability of agreeing in advance on the precise terms of the topic. What exactly does "Asia" represent? How does one define "civilization"? These questions were necessarily left open for exploration. One might accept the definition of civilization offered herein by Professor Wittfogel as referring to "the totality of the cultural conditions (ideas and beliefs) of a given country," which for his own purposes he distinguishes from "society": "the totality of its institutional conditions." Or one might follow the view of Professor Berry that a civilization represents a "dynamic equilibrium of many forces that are constantly interacting upon one another" and that "we have no adequate way of describing the unity that is observable in this process of change." In either case, one must admit the inexhaustible complexity both of "civilization" itself and of the methods by which we must seek to understand it. Hence the need to approach the subject from as many vantage points as our various scholarly disciplines afford and to proceed inductively toward a conception of what civilization represents. Each of the papers presented here is meant to enlarge our own understanding of the problem, without presuming to settle it for all time.

For purposes of our discussion, diverse conceptions of Asia had

also to be considered. It has become almost anathema to speak of Asia as a unity, so conscious are scholars of the distinctiveness of its various civilizations and the superficiality of most generalizations applied to Asia as a whole. Moreover, given the impossibility of presenting or comprehending all of Asia in a single course, what one chooses to include in one's definition of Asia will vary with one's conception of civilization, and what one selects of the areas and aspects to be dealt with will reflect a diversity of approaches to the problem as well as the inherent diversity of the subject.

Allowing for this, however, our contributors seem to agree that there is a significant interlocking among the major civilizations of Asia, distinct though they may be from one another, and that there is a value in treating several of these together. This is true, substantively speaking, in terms of the common factors affecting the rise of these civilizations and their historical interactions. It is also true, pedagogically speaking, in terms of providing the Western student with a basis of comparison that is not purely Western. Thus, the geographer will show that important "continental" factors such as climate, mountain and river systems, and communications conditioned the development of these civilizations in a similar way; the anthropologist, that there are common features in the prehistoric racial and cultural substrata of Asian civilizations; the historian of religion, that pilgrims and missionaries moving across Asia established important transcultural links among these countries; and so forth. At the same time, even where there is no such historical link and the paths of Asian peoples diverge most widely, the very contrast among them forces us to seek deeper reasons for apparent peculiarities than lie on the surface of native tradition alone, or than would appear from direct comparison with the West.

But it is especially when we consider the Asia of today that we see its traditional diversity yielding to a new unity. As Professor Lerner expresses it with regard to the emerging modern civilization of the Near and Middle East, "The unifying element in the Middle East is not its past but its future. The historic 'sharing' of Muslim

learning, Shariya law, Arabic language has shown itself to be a weak link. Far more compelling is the challenge brought home to every Middle Eastern country by the challenge of modernization." In his view, our understanding of this modernization process "goes far beyond the Middle East to include each and all of the great and small Oriental civilizations. It is this understanding that seems worth conveying to an undergraduate who will not be a specialist, for we are concerned with a historic process whose personal consequences are being felt acutely by many hundreds of millions of people outside of the diminutive Western world and will continue to be felt by their children."

Nor is this unity wholly of the future, but also of the present. Already this feeling of common aspiration has produced in Asians a sense of identity strangely in contrast to their past disparity. One recalls the upsurge of "Asian" sentiment at the dawn of the century when Japan's defeat of Russia evoked a passionate response from young Jawaharlal Nehru, "who dreamed of fighting, sword in hand, for 'Asiatic freedom from the thralldom of Europe'"[1] and from the Arab at Suez of whom Sun Yat-sen reported: "The joy of this Arab, as a member of the great Asiatic race, seemed to know no bounds."[2] True, such sentiments have not made of Nehru so much of an Asian that he is kept from looking to the West as well as to the East. Yet their appeal is felt even by the strongly Western-oriented Filipinos, drawing them to the East as well as to the West and, as recent developments in their foreign relations show, prompting them to seek a place for themselves within a specifically Asian framework.

It is probably safe to say that most students today, despite the growing appreciation of Oriental art and their curiosity about Oriental religion, develop an interest in Asia most directly from their concern with the contemporary scene. It is the newspaper

[1] Jawaharlal Nehru, *Toward Freedom* (New York, John Day, 1941), p. 29.

[2] Marius B. Jensen, *The Japanese and Sun Yat-sen* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 117.

headlines that stir them to learn more, and it is a political context into which they most often try to fit their first knowledge of Asia. From my own experience of teaching and lecturing to different audiences, Americans "come alive" in grasping Asian problems the closer one comes to the present and to Western involvement in the picture. This is natural, and most teachers responsible for introductory courses on Asia must inevitably try to satisfy this curiosity at the same time that they seek to go beyond it. No such course can fulfill the purposes of general education if it does not illumine both the present and the past. We must recognize the natural and legitimate interest in current affairs on the one hand; on the other, we must guard against the tendency to think of Asian peoples too much in terms of their direct effect upon our own lives. This was the great error of the pre-World War II period, which proved self-defeating insofar as it was preoccupied with surface phenomena and was unprepared to gauge the real depth and complexity of Asian reactions to the West.

The purposes of a truly liberal or humanistic education will be served only if we accept the peoples and civilizations of Asia, not as factors in the cold war or as means to some immediate practical end but because their experience in living together, what they have learned about life and what they have come to understand about the universe, is now seen as part of the common human heritage. They are to be studied, therefore, as people who can teach us much about ourselves, whose past can give us a new perspective on our own history, and whose way of looking at things challenges us to reexamine our own attitudes.

If this is so, then a course in "world politics" or "international relations of the Far East," whatever its value to specialists, would not meet the need. Something else is necessary to bring the traditional civilization of Asia into significant relation both with the modern world and with the modern student as an individual in a formative stage of his own thinking. But what is it to be? In general, the answer has been of two kinds: one is the establishment of intro-

ductory survey courses covering anything from a single Asian civilization to all of Asia; the other is the incorporation of some Asian materials in existing survey courses, converting them ostensibly from Western civilization, history, or literature courses to "world history" or "world literature" courses.

Both of these approaches have been tried and each has its own effectiveness, depending on the circumstances. To choose between them may be a gratuitous exercise. Given the limitations on curriculum and staff at many institutions and the difficulty of adding new courses, it may be argued that any opening for the inclusion of Asian materials in existing courses should be exploited. Such exigency may indeed be seen as a virtue by those who believe that to set up separate Asian courses is only to perpetuate a false dichotomy between East and West. All subjects should be taught on a universal basis, they argue, and there should be none peculiarly "Asian."

There is, however, a considerable gap between the actuality and the ideal here, between the tentative piecemeal inclusion of Asian materials in existing surveys and the full scale assimilation of them that would be required to put our learning and teaching on a truly universal basis. As an ideal to be striven for the latter is perhaps unexceptionable, but as a basis for our present efforts it involves serious difficulties. One of the most fundamental is that even on the most advanced theoretical level our scholarly disciplines are still far from achieving such an assimilation. We have no convenient and accepted framework in which to present world civilization as a whole. Indeed, even the monumental efforts of a few venturesome minds toward working out such a conceptual or theoretical framework have tended to be viewed with skepticism by specialists in each area as failing by far to take into account the complexities and intricacies of the Asian reality. And it is worth noting in this connection that the more advanced Asian nations themselves have not solved this problem in their own educational systems.[3]

[3] Cf. G. D. Parikh, *General Education and Indian Universities* (Bombay, 1959), pp. 132, 188.

Of the practical difficulties confronting the attainment of this ideal in education, certainly the most formidable is the undergraduate's ignorance of Asia and the need for Asia to make a massive intrusion into his mind before he can appreciate how stupendous is his lack. The piecemeal approach may add dashes of color to his intellectual landscape; it cannot truly enlarge his horizons. Only a stay of some length in this new territory will enable him to advance from mere tourism to genuine understanding—so inescapable are the differences in names and terms and the whole orientation of life and thought. Even granting that much more can be done to provide in secondary education the kind of factual information on Asia that is basic to further learning, it may still be questioned whether we can expect that the Western student's preparation for Asia will ever be brought to the level of his knowledge concerning the West. Certainly, few would claim that our students' acquaintance with the Western tradition is already more than sufficient on the high school level, and, therefore, that Asia could take a much larger place without crowding the basic curriculum.

As a sidelight on this question, one should consider the parallel developments in certain Asian countries, notably India and Japan, where educators of a humanistic persuasion have recently deplored the excessively "Western" emphasis in college education. They, too, have come to believe in the need for courses in the Oriental humanities, which would reacquaint students with their own classical traditions. A major infusion, not occasional mention, is their remedy for this deplorable neglect.[4]

A further point of fundamental importance is raised by Herbert Feis when he urges, movingly and cogently, that the student of Oriental civilizations should impose upon himself the requirement of learning a great deal about American civilization as well. "This is not needed by those who study the Orient as a whim or out of

[4] Cf. Yoshikawa Kojirō, *Nihon bummei ni okeru juyō to nōdō* (Receptivity and Activity in Japanese Civilization) (Tokyo, Shinchosha, 1959), chapter 1; "Report of the University Education Committee" (chairman, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan) (Government of India, 1950), pp. 55–63, 66.

intermittent curiosity, or as a collector of art objects and books. Nor by those who intend to remain observers of our relations with the Orient. . . . But a comprehensive and vibrant knowledge of American civilization is vital for anyone who takes an active part in the course or conduct of American relations with the Orient." Thus the knowledge of Asia which Mr. Feis seeks is one based on self-knowledge, and cannot be gained at the expense of education in one's own tradition, by which one becomes truly aware of its strengths and weaknesses. Asian studies, in this view, are not merely a supplement to Western learning but a vital extension of that learning, in its most dispassionate, self-conscious and yet also selfless form. To proceed without this grounding is to risk losing one's way altogether.

One sometimes hears from enthusiastic proponents of Asian studies as an "antidote to Western parochialism" that the proper place for a course on Asia is the freshman year in college. In this way, they contend, one catches the student while he is still "fresh" and unprejudiced by intense exposure to a traditional Western point of view. Actually, nothing could be further from sound educational procedure. Whatever the timing and sequence of undergraduate courses (which may be governed by other practical considerations, extraneous to the issue here), still it is profitless to assume that general education in the Western tradition must be prejudicial to a true understanding of the East. On the contrary, experience shows that a genuine appreciation of one is the best qualification for the other. These two basic needs—an adequate grounding in the major contributions to the development of Western civilization and a substantial exposure to the contributions of Asian civilizations—should be seen, not as incompatible or antagonistic but as complementary and mutually indispensable.

It need not be argued, in favor of such a program, that it satisfies completely the requirements of general education. Europe and Asia do not exhaust the possibilities. Other areas, too, have made their contribution in different ways, and eventually the educated man

must learn of them too. But the embracing of all such areas in a single course under the heading perhaps of "Non-Western Civilization" has definite disadvantages. "Non-Western" is essentially a negative concept, suggesting that the primary significance of civilizations outside Europe and North America lies in their difference from the West. Indeed, the seeming impartiality with which so many civilizations are thus equated (actually negated) tends to obscure the true proportions of their respective contributions. The positive significance of Asia in particular tends to be obscured when it is simply lumped together with other areas equally different from the modern West, which by implication becomes the norm for all.

If it seems undemocratic and discriminatory to assign a higher priority (though certainly not an exclusive claim) to the major Asian civilizations, this is nevertheless justified by the greater richness and depth of their traditions, by the historical contributions to and influence upon other peoples beyond their own borders, and by the impressive continuity and stability of their traditional institutions down through the ages. It is little wonder that the natural interest of Westerners today should spontaneously incline them to learn about Asia, for here are the peoples whose technological "underdevelopment" can never be mistaken for immaturity of culture or society. Their social experience—their population problems, their political institutions, their economic dilemmas—in many ways anticipate those of the modern West. Their arts, literature, philosophy and religion in some respects achieved a refinement surpassing our own.

To focus, then, on Asian civilizations in a general education program is only to signify that there is more than enough matter here worthy of the student's attention and reflection, on a level with and as challenging for him as that which he encounters in Western civilization. Global scope—with Russia, Africa, South America, and what not thrown in—need not be the criterion, when to discover any one of the major Asian civilizations is virtually to discover a whole new world, and two or three of them a new universe.

This is most true, however, in approaching the traditional civilizations of Asia, and has less force when it comes to discussion of contemporary problems. These the Asian nations, new and old, share with other areas of the world caught up in the process of modernization and industrialization. To the extent that the contemporary or current-affairs aspect is emphasized in such a survey course, and especially if one can assume a prior acquaintance with the traditional civilization involved in the modern transformation, it is wholly appropriate to view this problem in the context of world-wide experience with a common trend or process. Even then, however, unless the problem of modernization is examined in the light of certain specific disciplines, which limit the field of investigation to manageable proportions by isolating it from other aspects of civilization, it seems only prudent to focus the discussion on a well-defined geographic area and thus give greater point to generalizations derived from the wider field.

For purposes of our conference and the proceedings which follow, Asia has been considered to represent four main centers of civilization: Islamic, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese, and by extension those regions strongly influenced by each of these civilizations. It was not our intention thereby to define the components or units of a course in Asian civilizations, but simply to illustrate in different contexts the problems involved in such study. In actual practice the possible combinations of areas are not unlimited. Most colleges with well-established programs on Asia for undergraduates recognize these as the major areas, whether they attempt to cover them all in a single course, separate courses for each area, or some combination such as the inclusion of China and Japan in the Far Eastern area. The relative advantages and disadvantages of any such arrangement have been dealt with elsewhere[5] and were not a topic for discussion at this conference. Our approach to the subject has been through the

[5] See Eugene P. Boardman (ed.) *Asian Studies in Liberal Education* (Washington, D.C., 1959); Ward Morehouse (ed.) *Asian Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges* (Washington, D.C., 1961).

various disciplines pertaining to the study of these areas, whether singly or in combination, hoping that the results might be relevant to any scheme of organization adopted according to local needs and capabilities.

Nevertheless, if we have taken the major civilizations of Asia together, rather than individually, as the scope of our discussion, it is because they represent a sufficient degree both of unity and diversity to illumine one another. In these relatively well-defined areas we may examine the pervasive problems of the ancient agrarian civilizations, the economic relationships, social arrangements and political institutions which contributed to the stability and durability of the most mature Oriental civilizations, and then see these alongside the comparatively younger, more dynamic and less stable society of Japan. We have an opportunity also to study the historical role of the major religious and philosophical traditions—Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic and Confucianist—as well as those lesser ones—Jain, Taoist, Shintoist, for instance—which help to underline the complexity of national traditions and the richness of Oriental thought in general. This choice of areas has the advantage, too, of presenting the historical confrontation of these systems with one another on common ground—in India, Buddhism and Hinduism, Islam and Hinduism; in China, Buddhism and Confucianism; in Japan, both of these with each other and with Shinto. Similarly the adaptations and permutations of a single tradition as it develops in different historical circumstances may be considered, as for instance the Confucian tradition in close association with the dominant civil bureaucratic elite of China, on the one hand, and with the dominant military aristocracy of Tokugawa Japan on the other. Even the total absence of something like Confucianism in India acquires unexpected significance, when one considers that, lacking it, India was unable to maintain the bureaucratic continuity and dynastic control characteristic of China.

In any introduction to Asia, such comparative questions as these must be considered as suggestive only; they cannot be pursued ex-

haustively for their own sake.[6] Where elements of similarity and difference are seen bound up together, the differences assume greater significance than they would as discrete facts. New meaning attaches to historical or social data that in isolation seem of no importance. And yet this same awareness tells us that thorough-going comparison would lead further and deeper into the labyrinth of each civilization than it is feasible for the nonspecialist to follow. (There is a question, indeed, whether it is feasible even for the specialist, given the present state of our knowledge). Therefore it seems prudent to avoid involvement in any overall comparison of civilizations, and to put primary emphasis on the articulation of each civilization within itself, while yet placing it side-by-side with others and compelling the student to develop a perspective which embraces both.

A proper introduction thus serves the purposes of liberal education in two ways. It broadens the horizons of the mind and liberates it from preoccupation with the immediate. At the same time it opens up new vistas, not in the sense of attaining the heights of knowledge and surveying in lordly fashion a vast domain, but rather in the sense of coming to a new realization of how much there is to be known. One thus appreciates the significance of specialized study for what it can contribute to our overall knowledge and for what painstaking labor is involved in making it available to others. Such an introduction should, then, leave the student eager to know more

[6] Since my views on this question are discussed later by Prof. Hsu, some further clarification is needed. To the making of comparisons I am not in general opposed. These must, however, remain implicit or suggestive only, unless, the comparison, as I have stated elsewhere, "deals with specific features or concepts in each work for which the grounds of comparability are well established and explicitly defined. Comparisons of whole traditions or religions are almost always out of place and have nothing essentially to do with general education." (See my preface to *A Guide to Oriental Classics*). Prof. Hsu's criteria for explicit comparison seem wholly appropriate to me, but time and circumstances do not often allow for such thorough-going analysis in class, and it seems best not to indulge in comparison as a regular practice if these criteria cannot be fully observed. Students are all too prone to glib comparison and it is my experience as a teacher in survey courses (which are particularly beset by this vice) that the instructor as often finds it necessary to restrain or question such judgments as to suggest or stimulate them.

about each of the civilizations he has encountered, rather than feeling that this survey has sized them up for him and he need go no further.

The essays that follow are meant to illustrate both aspects of the study of Asian civilizations referred to above. Some, usually historians or anthropologists, attempt to see each civilization essentially from within, emphasizing growth and development within a single pattern, but making specific comparisons to other civilizations where they shed light on their own. Others, usually representing the social sciences studying the contemporary world, stress general problems or trends that cut across national or historical boundaries. Both of these approaches are combined in the actual teaching of Asian civilizations in America today. There is frequent discussion as to the respective advantages of the historical and topical methods of presenting Asian civilization. In fact both approaches serve a purpose and neither can be dispensed with. A purely historical presentation is almost inconceivable if justice is to be done to the many-sidedness of a civilization. The complexities of social organization, economic problems, political institutions, thought, and religion—to say nothing of literature and the arts—must somehow be compressed into summary form, into generalizations that can serve as footholds for further study. The survey that undertakes an historical account of each such topic will have difficulty getting past 1 A.D. On the other hand, some general historical outline or chronological order of presentation is necessary if the misleading impression of a static civilization is not to be given, if the dynamic interaction of its parts is to be understood. There is the further, quite realistic consideration for most teachers that a chronological order is the simplest common denominator among civilizations and the most reliable framework for the student to hang onto when more complicated structures fail.

In most cases a compromise is worked out whereby either the subject matter is organized in topics presented in some general chronological order, or else major periods or events in the history

of a country are used to exemplify characteristic features of the civilization at a formative stage. The precise combination will vary according to the disciplinary qualifications and outlook of the instructor in charge, the availability of specialists to supplement his efforts in presenting certain topics, and—always—the time at his disposal. There is no exact recipe for the combination of ingredients, and the papers here prescribe none. But it is remarkable how much convergence there is in independent judgments of the key topics to be covered in respect to a given civilization. Take, for example, China. Professor Wright has identified what he calls nine "nodal points" or "formative experiences" in the history of China which "encompass the total formative experiences that make a people what they are and not otherwise." There are, as he says, "developments on the economic, political, intellectual and other planes of history which permit each historian to emphasize what he knows best and finds most interesting." Thus the significance of each such stage may be variously interpreted by the individual teacher, but if we may judge from the textbooks or course syllabi used around the country, there is little dispute that one way or another these same key points in Chinese history must be treated in any introductory survey. This is true also, I believe, of the topics singled out by Professor Crane in respect to India and by Professor Craig in respect to Japan. For those charged with planning such courses for the first time in a liberal arts curriculum, it should be reassuring that there is such a concensus to serve as a guide.

A much broader topic of discussion, dealt with most fully by Professor Crane but a recurrent theme in other papers as well, is the distinction between traditional and modern civilization. Here again definitions vary widely among historians like Professor Crane, sociologists like Professor Lerner, and economists like Professors Lockwood and Issawi. Moreover definitions which fit the facts of one civilization such as India may fit very imperfectly in the case, say, of Japan. These discrepancies do not, however, detract from the usefulness of such categories of analysis in provoking the stu-

dent to think more deeply and to consider on the basis of his total survey the applicability of such definitions to the manifold reality he is studying. For most students, it is the problem of the Asian countries' "coming of age" which serves as the point of their initial interest, and a course which undertakes to discuss the Asian civilizations in these terms will evoke a ready response.

For this reason, at Columbia (and I believe it is broadly true elsewhere), the basic divisions of our Oriental civilizations course are between the traditional civilizations in the first semester and the modernization process in the second semester. In the former we take up the traditional civilizations of India, China and Japan in that order. (For practical reasons Islamic civilization is treated in a separate course, with the same traditional-modern division between semesters). In the second semester the order is not quite so neat. Modern India is presented first, since Western power and influence were exerted there first and most fully. But then Meiji Japan is taken up, as the first example of resurgent nationalism and modernization in Asia, before examining the long process of disintegration in the Manchu empire and the unsuccessful efforts to reconstitute a stable social and political order before the outbreak of full hostilities between China and Japan in 1937. At this point we turn back to Japan, to the struggle between divergent forces in Japanese national life from the first world war to the present. Finally we take up the collapse of Nationalist China and Chinese communism.

We do not feel strongly attached or committed to this particular sequence of chronological periods, and our source readings, which are bound in separate volumes for India, China and Japan, would be adaptable to other schemes of presentation. The important thing for us is that within a general chronological sequence we be able to take up broad movements or broad topics of significance to the development of the civilization as a whole rather than feel obliged to study every aspect of every period.

Parallel with this broad chronological development, which emphasizes institutional and intellectual history, we present at ap-

propriate junctures supplementary materials for discussion and audio-visual illustration. The arts, crafts, architecture and music of Asia may thus be introduced to enliven the proceedings. Special reports may also be assigned to suggest new dimensions of study which the use of standard textbooks might otherwise preclude. Thus, for instance, we have prepared supplementary readings on special "Problems in Asian Civilizations" through which a diversity of views and researches on a single historical or social problem might be examined. In this way the student is made aware of the range of scholarly debate and research which comes into play if, departing briefly from the broad survey method, we pause to examine the microcosm. From this in turn the student may gain insight into the relevancy, depth or superficiality of the survey itself.

At the other pole are writers who deal with Asian civilizations on a macrocosmic scale, such as Toynbee, Wittfogel, Northrop, or even less academically, Koestler ("The Lotus and the Robot"). To introduce these at the beginning, as if to suggest a range of methodological approaches, might well prejudice or distort the picture. There is danger of the student's becoming entranced or entangled in theoretical constructs before he has been exposed to any of the facts. To bring such writers in at the end of a survey, however, gives the student an opportunity to test their constructs against his own new store of knowledge and impressions, to weigh their plausibility in accounting for all the facts, or to gauge the extent of their applicability to certain aspects of Oriental civilizations but not to others. At the same time, of course, in the encounter with such writers he becomes aware of alternative schemes for organizing the information crowded into his survey, and gains some perspective on the original choices made by his instructors in the planning of the course.

For the instructor, however, these choices are not made once and for all at the inception of the course. They must be reviewed constantly in the light of new knowledge in the field and of experience in teaching (experience which more often indicates how much needs

to be cut out than what should be added). In a field as underdeveloped and rapidly growing as Asian studies, new knowledge and interpretations compel us regularly to revise the generalizations which are essential to any introductory survey. In this respect all teachers of Asian civilizations face a similar problem of trying to keep abreast of developments in widely varied fields, though no doubt the problem is most acute in smaller colleges where the number of specialists to be consulted is quite limited. It is to meet this never-ending need, that the discoveries of eminent specialists and the views of experienced teachers have been brought together in this volume.

WM. THEODORE DE BARY