

Reviews

WOLF-HAGEN KRAUTH, RALF WOLZ (eds.), *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung: Asien- und Afrikawissenschaft im Umbruch*. (Studien und Materialien der interdisziplinären Arbeitsgruppe Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998. 502 pages, DM 128,-. ISBN 3-05-003271-5

After the fall of the wall a rapid deconstruction and reconstruction of the scientific landscape occurred in the former German Democratic Republic. It consisted of: (a) a displacement of old scientific "cadres" and their replacement by West German scientists; (b) a renewal of the curricula and research agendas. In 1994 a research group entitled "Science and Reunification" (*Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung*) was formed in the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften to investigate this scientific change. In 1997 it brought out its final report. Among the disciplines investigated were the Asia and Africa sciences – the focus of this book. In the former GDR these consisted of the following sub-disciplines: history, literature and language, social science and geography, and, in particular, a combination of basic research and practice orientation.

Research methods applied by the research team consisted of pre-structured interviews with former scientific staff and experts from the ministries, as well as document analyses. Broadly speaking, the interviews focused on change in research and teaching themes, and academic relations to the scientific and non-scientific environment. Questions of interest were the differentiation of the discipline into sub-disciplines and their rank order, the relation between fundamental and applied research, the relevance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the main PhD themes with regard to the question, which topics could be investigated and to what extent there was political interference, public access to research reports and theses, interdisciplinary contact, cooperation with and integration into transnational Western and Eastern networks, self-understanding in relation to politics, and the like.

The introduction of the book (written by the editors Wolf-Hagen Krauth and Ralf Wolz) explains the background of this study. The contributions cover a wide spectrum of regional studies: East Asia (Thomas Kampen), South Asia (Kerrin Gräfin Schwerin, Dieter Rothermund), Africa (Ulrich van der Heyden), and the Middle East (Kai Hafez and Gerhard Höpp). Another report investigates orientalism (Hans Heumann), Asian and African Studies in the German Democratic Republic (Wolf-Hagen Krauth), and the subject of regional science in general (Waltraud Schelkle). The last part of the book includes a documentation and comments on the reports (Thea Büttner, Günther Barthel and Hartmut Schilling).

It is hardly possible to summarize these reports of the research commission. Furthermore, for scholars of Asia, only some chapters are of particular interest. I will therefore comment only on a few contributions. Schelkle analyzes the self-understanding of the regional science (*Regionalwissenschaft*) of the German Democratic Republic. She concludes that this discipline was less concerned with regional or developmental studies, but a social science with an emphasis on language training (not only in regional languages, but also in Russian, English and French), Marxist-Leninist philosophy and history (as it was and still is found in Russian universities). Discourse on regional affairs played only a subordinate role. The discipline was characterized by a theoretical conservatism, which was due to the tendency to adhere to the old-established theories: Marxist stage theories, imperialism theories, discussions of modes of production etc. In general, the academic output was not available to the public. In contrast to the GDR, the concept of regional studies (or area studies) was less developed in the West, where an approach of developmental studies was preferred, covering several regions under a thematic umbrella.

Kampen deals with East Asian studies (China, North Korea and Japan), which were deeply influenced by the changing political relations of the GDR with these countries, with China in particular. Here research was carried out mainly by order of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or by advice from Moscow. Research topics were primarily economic and related to the present, and the results were kept behind closed doors. Scientific networks were mainly directed towards Eastern Europe. An exception in regional studies, a number of students and scientists were able to visit China. After reunification, the curricula and research interests of Sinology, as they exist in the BRD, came to dominate Chinese studies in Eastern Germany.

Schwerin investigates South Asian studies. Particular to these was a theoretical discussion of topics such as caste and class or the Asiatic mode of production, which should help to explain why the transition from feudalism to capitalism had not yet occurred on the South Asian subcontinent. Covering the whole subcontinent, the main emphasis in South Asian studies was on India. This country was interesting in so far as it did not belong to the socialist world and was theoretically labelled as belonging to the capitalist block, in spite of its freedom from block membership. But India was the third-largest trading partner of the USSR and a potential market for the GDR. For India in turn, the Federal Republic was much more interesting from the economic point of view. Main scientific topics covered social history (class formation and class consciousness), political history (colonialism and independence), economic history and policy, as well as contemporary policy. A distinguishing feature of the South Asian Studies was that they hardly dealt with general topics of fundamental research. Rothermund adds a short contribution to the topic of class formation.

The book is more than a mere report. It is a documentation of what happened to most social scientists (and scientists in general) after reunification: they were displaced or, using a semantic invention of the German language, *abgewickelt* and nowadays lead an existence beyond the formal academic system. In his comment

Schilling rightly asks what the intention of this investigation was. Should it legitimize this *Abwicklung* ex post by proving that social science was ideologically distorted? A look at the members of the commission shows that they were largely *Wessis* (scientists from the FRG), while the *Ossis* were primarily relegated to the role of the study objects, interviewees, most of whom were dismissed. Or should the research group investigate the chances which the convergence of a West and East German social science had offered or might offer to develop the entire discipline further by integrating both East German and West German elements in the new regional studies/developmental studies after reunification? The answer to this question is disappointing. The old regional science was dismantled, and Indology or Sinology of the Federal Republic simply took over. This was related to the transfer of West German scientists to the now vacant or new chairs in Eastern Germany, who simply continued their former work.

Heiko Schrader

RONALD J. MAY, VIBERTO SELOCHAN (Hrsg.), *The Military and Democracy in Asia and the Pacific*. London: C. Hurst & Co., Bathurst: Crawford House Publishing, 1998. viii, 197 Seiten, A\$ 29.95

Der vorliegende Sammelband, der im Kontext des an der Australian National University in Canberra angesiedelten Projekts „Regime Change and Regime Maintenance in Asia and the Pacific“ entstanden ist, thematisiert die einflussreiche, wenn nicht sogar dominierende Rolle, die das Militär in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten besonders in asiatischen Staaten gespielt hat. Dies betrifft sowohl die Initiierung und Förderung gesellschaftlicher Prozesse von Demokratisierung als auch deren Blockierung. Die Häufigkeit militärischer Interventionen in die nationale Politik legt nahe, dass es sich dabei eher um die Norm denn die Ausnahme handelt.

In ihrer Einführung zeichnen die Herausgeber May und Selochan sowie Stephanie Lawson die Argumentationslinien des politikwissenschaftlichen Diskurses nach, der nach den Gründen von Militärcoups sucht. Obwohl die Verfassungsstrukturen eines Großteils der hier thematisierten Staaten Asiens und des Pazifik durch westliche Demokratiemodelle der früheren Kolonialmächte stark beeinflusst wurden, kann in vielen Fällen von einer Anerkennung des Primats der Politik durch das Militär kaum die Rede sein. Erste Erklärungsansätze sahen die Gründe für militärische Interventionen in Unterentwicklung, Ineffizienz, Korrumpierung oder Fraktionierung ziviler politischer Institutionen. Diesen stand häufig ein besser organisiertes und durch eine Kultur der Rationalität und Modernität motiviertes Militär gegenüber, das zudem stärker in die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Gesellschaft involviert war oder gar als deren Vorbedingung angesehen wurde. Alternative Ansätze wiederum heben die Wahrung von Gruppeninteressen, persönliche Ambitionen oder Fraktionierungen unter Putschführern hervor.

Weitere Studien unternahmen den Versuch, Klassifizierungen von Putschen und Putschversuchen sowie von militärischen und zivil-militärischen Regimen aufzustellen. Angesichts der Vielfalt an Formen der Intervention durch Streitkräfte (Putsch