

edge spillover effect, and a third by Zsuzsanna Mangu (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) on corporate reputation and national image-building in Taiwanese advertisements.

Panel 11, "Research on Taiwan's Indigenous Peoples", was opened by Kerim Friedman (National Dong Hwa University, Hualian), who examined the standardization of regional Amis language varieties. Wen-li Ke (Leiden University) then discussed indigenous heritage and culture as well as related creative industries in Taiwan.

Panel 12, "Taiwan's Changing Geopolitical Situation", dealt with more recent cross-Strait developments. Sebastian Biba (National Chengchi University, Taipei) asked whether the triangular relationships between the US, China, and Taiwan are still appropriate to explain cross-Strait relations from an international perspective. Alex Calvo (European University of Barcelona) compared the island issues of Senkaku to those of the Falkland Islands. Jens Damm (Chang Jung Christian University, Tainan) compared the perception of new migrants from Taiwan with the perceptions of Taiwanese migrants to China using media text from the two sides of the Taiwan Strait, and concluded that there are many similarities in the negative stereotyping of the migrant other. Lutgard Lams (HU Brussels, Catholic University of Louvain) asked whether inter-ethnic relations and issues of identity in a general sense are still deemed relevant to Taiwanese politics after the re-election of the KMT in 2008.

The MA panel was opened by Huichun Song (SOAS) discussing Taiwan's youth subcultures and identities in films. Wan-Zi Lu (NTU & SOAS) discussed the quality of the indigenous support for the KMT since 1997, concluding that the ethnic identification process has not featured as strongly in the voting behavior of the Aborigines as it has in other ethnic groups. Darema Eleni (SOAS) analyzed the causes and the international repercussions of the 1995-1996 cross-Strait crises.

Jens Sjerup, Isabelle Cheng and Simona Grano all received a Young Scholar Award for their outstanding papers.

The next annual conference will take place in 2013 in Lyon.

Jens Damm, Ann Heylen

The Asia-Pacific Maritime World: Connected Histories in the Age of Empire

Projekt C12 The Asian Sea, Universität Heidelberg, 06.-08. Juli 2012

The aim of this conference was to question the ways in which scholars tend to divide the maritime world into spatial blocs like the 'Atlantic World', the concept of 'Mediterranean' blocs, etc. Instead, we wanted to focus on the nature of maritime connections between the 'Pacific' world and a space that is often characterized by scholars of the pre-modern period as the 'East Asian Mediterranean'.

By placing East Asia in a wider Pacific context, one that reflects the reality of steamships beginning to cross greater distances with relative ease, we hoped to broaden our understanding of the ways in which maritime space was both imagined and lived during the long nineteenth century. Thus, instead of focusing on land-based issues such as extraterritoriality, we wanted to examine the relationship between ports and new maritime networks, so as to develop a more fluid, comparative sense of shifting East Asian-Pacific sovereignties in this period. Drawing on the new maritime history of the British Empire, of 'home' on the water and of the naval 'theatre' we wanted to consider the relationship between ships, the sea and the East Asian/Western imperial imagination. To complement our focus on sovereignty and

imagination, we planned also to examine the significance of the increasing numbers of goods, peoples and even diseases crossing between and within East Asia and the Pacific. In short, we hoped to ask how does the categorization of 'Asian' and 'Pacific' maritime blocs in this period change when we attempt to write connected histories 'on' as well as 'of' the sea?

The conference opened with introductory remarks by organizer Martin Dusinberre (Newcastle/Heidelberg), who expressed skepticism with our post-Braudelian urge to label every seascape 'Mediterranean' in some way or another. To label particular spaces in this way – including the label, 'Asian Sea' – is to ask the wrong question, referring back to the distinction between histories 'of' and 'on' the seas. Quoting the recent work of Paul Kramer (2011), who suggests that '[a] language of the "imperial" rather than "empire" can help avoid connotations of unity and coherence – thingness – that tend to adhere to the latter term...', Dusinberre said that by the same logic, a language of 'maritime' (an adjective) rather than of a particular 'sea' (a noun) would help scholars avoid the implied unity and coherence of an 'Asian Sea' or seas. Nevertheless, for practical purposes it was necessary to have some kind of geographical frame on the discussion, and therefore the focus on Asia-Pacific interactions was one way of trying to go beyond the Asia-Europe focus of the Cluster so as to offer a truly 'global context' for the history of the nineteenth century.

In the first panel Ronald Chung-Yam Po (Heidelberg), Chi Kong Lai (Queensland) and Rotem Kowner (Haifa) explored in different ways the relationship between the state and the sea, be it the extent to which the High Qing distinction between 'inner' and 'outer' sea-spaces was challenged by the arrival of European gunboats and the treaty port system (Po), or the strategies by which the late Qing responded to European commercial interests in East Asia through the establishment of new steamship companies (Lai). Kowner's paper offered important macro-historical perspective on these and other issues with his discussion of rival imperial strategies within Asia and the Pacific Ocean more generally in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Joachim Kurtz (Heidelberg) questioned where the boundary between 'inner' and 'outer' seas might have lain and how it might have changed across time. More broadly, he wondered whether there was anything particularly uniquely Chinese to this conception of maritime space, or whether it couldn't also be applied to Euro-American interests in the Pacific.

The second panel shifted from macro- to micro-history, with a focus on three different sea voyages in the 1860s and 1870s: Joshua Fogel (York, Canada) examined the Japanese expedition to Shanghai in 1862 and in particular the ways in which the newly 'opened' Japan gained new knowledge about the outside world from their Chinese interlocutors through, conversely, the 'old' literary forms of *kanbun*. Gavin Campbell (Kioto) focused on the voyages of Nijijima Jo to the USA in 1864. Campbell traced the ways in which Nijijima's experiences on ship became a prism for his first knowledge of the outside world; yet for all that the *Wild Rover* represented great technological advancement to Nijijima, the ship was in fact part of a dying breed of clippers traversing the Pacific, a sign that the USA was beginning to fall behind to the technological advances of Europe even as it also was tearing itself apart in civil war. Cindy McCreery (Sydney) traced local responses to the naval tours of Prince Alfred between 1867 and 1871. Her paper particularly examined 'loyal addresses' to Alfred and the HMS *Galatea* from British colonial subjects in the South Pacific, arguing that Alfred's arrival offered a chance for the host communities to fashion for themselves a narrative of historical identity and local achievement. Martin Hoffman (Heidelberg) highlighted the constant tensions between the ideals of international relations and their reality: such a micro-historical approach helps scholars understand the complex daily negotiations that took place on board

and at the pier as imperial and non-imperial regimes encountered each other in the Asia-Pacific region during this period.

Lisa Hellman (Stockholm) analysed spatial relations in late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century Canton, focusing on different arenas of interaction between 'East' and 'West', including the trading factories, the space of the ship, the significance of water in the port, and the role of women. Mio Wakita (Heidelberg) examined the iconography of Yokohama through the work of photography studios that targeted western consumers on their arrival in the treaty port. Tracing the ways in which such imagery changed across the second half of the nineteenth century, she argued that Yokohama was in many ways *disconnected* from the rest of Japan. Harald Fuess (Heidelberg) offered a legal perspective on the issue of port space by discussing the ways in which the foreign community in Yokohama responded to the problem of shipwrecks. He argued that we should try to see Yokohama less as an off-shoot of Tokyo and more as a truly Asia-Pacific port. Wayne Patterson (St. Norbert College) focused on the ways in which Great Power relations played themselves out in the Korean port city Pusan in the 1880s, offering a salutary reminder of the extent to which important decisions concerning the governance of the treaty ports often lay in the hands of a small number of male administrators. Commentator Madeleine Herren-Oesch (Heidelberg) posed the difficult and crucial question, what is it that makes a port a port – that is, were the four papers really concerned with ports *per se*, or were they actually describing cities more generally?

The fourth panel addressed the appearance of steamships in Asia-Pacific waters. Robert Antony (Macau) examined the ways in which pirate communities based on the coast of southern China adapted their tactics to the increasing number of steamships in the China Seas. Antony blurred the distinction between 'land' and 'sea' society by pointing out that most of the pirates were Chinese fishermen or sailors who sought to supplement their income, such that a social history of the sea forces us also to discuss the social history of the land. Martin Dusinberre used the story of the ship *Yamashiro-maru* in order to probe constructions of national identity in two 'sub-colonial' polities during the late-nineteenth century (Japan and Australia), and thus to think more broadly about the meaning of what C.A. Bayly has called 'the great acceleration' in world history. Ruth Mandujano (British Columbia) also focused on a single historical episode in order to probe the wider interplay between steamships, diplomatic history and transnational migration in the early-twentieth century. One significance of her paper was to reintegrate the history of Mexico into the Pacific maritime world. In this way, the panel offered a truly global view of the 'Asia-Pacific' – a view that encompassed southern China, Portugal, Australia, Hawai'i, Japan, Mexico and Great Britain. Luke Franks (Naperville) commented, that one of the major shifts that occurred during the second half of the twentieth century was that steamships became a normal part of maritime interaction, thus losing the novelty value that they had had for an earlier generation. But the three papers also showed the perils of attempting to associate steamships with particular national identities, especially given the fundamentally transnational character of the ships themselves, their passengers, crew, and even their pirate assailants.

In the final panel Katrina Gulliver (Newburgh) examined the idea of the Pacific in literary texts, thus highlighting the fact that the shortening of physical sea-space in the imagination was a phenomenon that actually predated the emergence of steam technology. Rudolph Ng (Heidelberg) offered an account of the mid-nineteenth-century coolie trade, in which he showed that Chinese agents were as complicit in the recruitment of forced labour as their European counterparts: there were multiple actors and institutions at play, and to trace their different roles helps scholars move away from simplistic tropes of East-victim and West-perpetrator. Robert Hellyer (Winston-Salem) used the example of the Japanese green tea

export industry in order to show not only the emergence of new networks between ports and the hinterland in Japan but also the significance of consumer tastes in the USA and their impact on the structure of the industry. Lars Schladitz (Erfurt) analysed the new frontiers of American scientific knowledge that accompanied the expansion of the US empire into the Pacific in the late 1890s by focusing on an American expedition to study Japanese whaling in the Japanese colony of Korea – an original approach that entangled not only the histories of colonists and the colonised in the Asia-Pacific arena, but also the interconnections between the worlds of humans and animals. David Mervart (Heidelberg) then challenged the panellists to consider whether they were attempting a ‘soft’ approach to maritime history (the recovery of historical episodes that have fallen through the net of national historiography) or ‘hard’ maritime history (the suggestion not only that national historiographies are missing some things, but that they are asking the wrong questions in the first place).

At the plenary session Jan Rüger (London) suggested a number of difficulties and opportunities raised by the conference as seen from a non-Asian, non-Pacific historical perspective. We have a choice bringing the focus back to the opening comments by Martin Dusinberre: do we seek the specifics of a maritime, Braudelian space in our scholarly endeavours, or do we get rid of all maritime spaces and simply do global history? There is no good answer to that question, nor, arguably, should there be; but the papers presented at the conference brought that particular problem into relief and also perhaps suggested the range of methodologies that we need to apply in our attempts to advance our understanding of the Asia-Pacific maritime world in the long nineteenth century.

Martin Dusinberre

China's Role in Asia: Research Approaches in Germany and Japan

Gemeinsame Konferenz der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Asienkunde und der Japanese Association for Asian Studies (JAAS), Tokio, 07.-08. Juli 2012

Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Asienkunde (DGA) und die Japanese Association for Asian Studies (JAAS) sind vergleichbare Vereinigungen von Forschern in vielen Bereichen, z.B. in den Forschungsgebieten, ihrer Größe und ihren Beziehungen zu den Regierungen. Aber sie hatten bislang keine Kontakte miteinander. Das Japanisch-Deutsche Zentrum Berlin (JDZB) hat die Initiative ergriffen und ein gemeinsames Symposium der beiden Gesellschaften sowie einen gemeinsamen Workshop über neue Ansätze der Asienstudien in Deutschland und Japan angeregt.

Am 7. Juli 2012 fand an der Rikkyo-Universität in Tokio der internationale Workshop „A Quest for Asian Studies in the 21st century: New Approaches to East Asia, Southeast Asia and South Asia“ statt, der gemeinsam von der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Asienkunde (DGA) und der Japanese Association for Asian Studies (JAAS) organisiert wurde und vom JDZB und der Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) unterstützt wurde. Bei dem Workshop wurde von Vertretern beider Gesellschaften die Bedeutung des interregionalen Austauschs für die Weiterentwicklung und Professionalisierung der Asienstudien betont.

Im Anschluß daran fand am 8. Juli 2012 im International House (Tokyo) die von der DGA, der JAAS, dem JDZB und der FES organisierte Konferenz „China's Role in Asia: Research Approaches in Germany and Japan“ statt. Ziel dieser Konferenz war es, thematisch auf Asien fokussierte Wissenschaftler aus beiden Organisationen zu einem akademischen Austausch über asienbezogene Forschungsansätze und -ergebnisse zusammenzubringen. Diskutiert wurden in drei thematischen Blöcken Fragen der innenpolitischen Herausforderungen für