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Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to review some research trends in investigations of matters pertaining to East Asia and Southeast Asia by Japanese geographers since the 1980s. It considers large-scale interdisciplinary research projects, research institutes/centers founded, and also a study group on Asia established under the Human Geographical Society of Japan. With the advent of economic and political globalization, Japanese geographers have now been able to visit formerly closed-door countries such as China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and some parts of Myanmar to do joint research with the collaboration of local scholars and other local people. With regard to China and Vietnam, the research environment has drastically changed in recent years. While these two countries have a large amount of material written on them in Chinese characters, making it accessible to Japanese geographers, these Japanese researchers had great difficulty organizing field studies because of political barriers. Nowadays, going through formal channels, we can conduct field studies individually or in groups, in both urban and rural areas. Various kinds of scientific grants, including JSPS (the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) grants as well as grants by private companies and non-profit foundations, have supported us in conducting studies abroad. This review will trace the history and prospects of these spheres of human geography from the perspective of new research trends such as transformation of rural/urban areas, appearance of new landscapes due to globalization, man-environment systems, resource utilization, alternative tourism, post-colonial dimensions of cities, and interregional exchange.
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I Historical Overview and Reviewers' Scope

The 24th International Geographical Congress was held in Tokyo in 1980, organized by the International Geographical Union (IGU). A book of proceedings called Geography of Japan was published in order to introduce the research conditions and interests of the field of geography in Japan (The Association of Japanese Geographers 1980). Unfortunately, this volume did not consider overseas studies done by Japanese geographers.

Kumagai (1998:5-8) reviews Japanese geographers' contribution to research on “Third World” nations from the postwar period to the early 1990s. From the perspective of discrepancies between geographers studying the Third World and geographical circles within Japan, he
categorizes this era into three periods: 1) the *pioneering period* (before the mid-1960s), when some Japanese geographers commenced their work independently, without much institutional support; 2) the *following period* (mid-1960s to 1970s) when some large-scale research projects were organized; and 3) the *contemporary period*, when much more interdisciplinary research occurred and a new generation of geographers emerged.

I would like to extend Kumagai’s approach another 25 years, emphasizing the overwhelming trend of the globalization of development studies. Even in field-observation-based studies, this trend cannot be ignored. We in Asian countries can now much more easily than before access a huge mass of, statistical data, learned discourse, and various other kinds of information through books, journals, mass media, and the internet. For example, the number of foreign students studying in Japan has tripled from 10,428 in 1983 to 141,774 in 2010 (MOET), the bulk of whom come from China, South Korea, and other East Asian countries. Most of this increased number are students at the undergraduate level, not those doing master’s or doctoral degrees. This trend holds in the field of geography.

In Japan, a boom in Asian languages has occurred since the 1990s. Many people from the younger generation have tried to learn Chinese or Korean, and some have achieved a good level of fluency.

Above all, however, the last 20 years has been an epoch growing Chinese prosperity, power, and influence all over the world. Chinese economic and political clout has become especially notable in Southeast Asian countries. At the same time, some ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) countries have also witnessed major economic development — these include Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam, each of which has come to have an increasing influence on adjacent countries.

In this context, I will review Japanese geographers’ contributions (through books and articles published in Japan) from the 1980s to the early 2010s, including the efforts of some scholars from Asian countries other than Japan who received their doctorates from prominent Japanese universities such as Tsukuba University, the University of Tokyo, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Nagoya University, Kyoto University, Hiroshima University, Osaka City University, and certain private universities. Thus, this paper reflects research trends in human geography in East and Southeast Asia as a whole, since many of these non-Japanese researchers have made careers at or worked closely with institutions in their home countries. My main concern is human geography, but I would also like to mention some environmental studies contributed by Japanese geographers.

In addition, some younger Japanese scholars have also studied at Korean or Chinese universities as graduate students and maintained research connections afterward. Examples of their work relating to China are Kojima (1999; 2003), Matsumura (1993; 1997; 2000), and Onodera (1997; 2002), and for South Korea, Yamamoto (2000; 2001; 2003; 2010), Shibuya (1990; 1995; 2010), and Todoroki (2013).

In Japan, over the last 30 years, various university textbooks, lecture series, and other publications on the geography of East and Southeast Asia have been produced. However, only one comprehensive regional geography of Southeast Asia (Haruyama et al. 2009) has been published by Japanese geographers, and none of East Asia as a whole. However, since the start of the present century alone, textbooks focusing on China (Ji 2008), Korea (Kamiya and Todoroki 2010), and Southeast Asia (Fujimaki and Segawa 2003, revised 2009) have appeared.

On the other hand, several comprehensive encyclopedias on specific regions or topics have
been published by Japanese institutes or academic societies. The *Encyclopedia of Southeast Asia* is a sophisticated compilation of work on Southeast Asian geographical diversity with a focus on regional eco-history and landscapes. Its editors divide Southeast Asia into six areas or terrain types: forest, plain, delta, volcanic islands, Wallacea (Timor, Sulawesi, and the Mark and Philippine Islands); and Irian Jaya (CSEAS 1991). Each area is described in terms of geology, topography, ecology, rural/urban transformation, and development.

Another recent encyclopedia considers the Chinese diaspora, or ethnic Chinese in the wider world (Kago et al. 2000). This international network of “marine Chinese” is very strong and has been hugely influential in Southeast Asian societies. “Marine Chinese power” has become a major research topic in the last 30 years partly because we can observe and interpret the lifestyles and cultural practices of these people all over the world, including Japan. Some Japanese geographers study newcomers and ‘oldcomers’ among overseas Chinese in various societies (e.g. Yamashita 2000; 2002; 2010).

However, no encyclopedia combines a look at the nature, history, economics, society, and culture of China. In Japan, there is a clear differentiation between classical and modern China studies: the former tradition emerges from the field of oriental studies in the pre-war period, and the latter from strategic research for colonial-imperial purposes by the South Manchurian Railway Company and the Governors-General of Korea and Taiwan.

More recent times have witnessed a gradual shift from historical geography of China done under a conventional or socialist-communist framework, to two generations of contemporary China studies. Studies on the modernity of the colonial city have been popular in this period, not only with regard to China but also Taiwan (Yo 1994; 2010), Korea (Yamamoto 2000; 2003), and Kuala Lumpur (Fujimaki). In addition, the Institute for Economic research at Osaka City University has compiled and supervised work on Asian megacities from the colonial to the contemporary period, with a focus on urban planning and problems. Five volumes have been published in this series, on Bangkok (Tasaka 1998), Jakarta (Miyamoto and Konagaya 1999), Kuala Lumpur and Singapore (Ikuta and Matsuzawa 2000), Manila (Nakanishi et al. 2001), and Beijing and Shanghai (Ueda and Koga 2002).

II The integrated method and its results: International joint research on East and Southeast Asia by national institutes

In the colonial-imperial era, many reports and some academic research were produced on Korea, Taiwan, some parts of China, and the South Sea Islands that Japan has acquired, claimed, or occupied. After the Asia-Pacific War (1937–1945), and the period of control by GHQ (“General Headquarters,” the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, 1945–1952), overseas studies became virtually impossible. After this time of hardship, a pioneering expedition studying rice culture in mainland Southeast Asian countries was launched by the Ethnological Society of Japan in the late 1950s. Scant research funds were supplemented by the assistance of newspaper companies and publishers. However, at that period, Japanese were not able to do fieldwork in China, Korea, and Taiwan.

Overseas fieldwork funded by the Ministry of Education began in 1963. Since then, many Japanese scholars have engaged in overseas field studies at government expense. However, China and Korea were still initially excluded because of the lack of diplomatic relations.

Two joint research institutes were established in the mid-1960s: the Center for Southeast
Asian Studies at Kyoto University (1964) and the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (1965). These institutes have become the pivot centers of area studies in Japan.

Subsequently, the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka opened in 1974 to make use of vacant land after the World Exposition of 1970. The museum became another important base for area studies and anthropological research in Japan, especially for Asian studies (including Japan). Prominent cultural geographers and anthropologists associated with the museum were Sasaki (specializing in shifting cultivation patterns and the origin of Japanese culture), Iwata (religion and society in Southeast Asia), and H. Sugimoto (folk housing).

The next national research center in the field was the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (IRCJS), established in Kyoto in 1987. The mandate of the IRCJS is to disseminate Japanese culture internationally and promote further joint study with researchers worldwide.

Senda, a historical geographer associated with the IRCJS, organized a project on “modern geography of traditional thinking in geography and the surrounding areas of East Asia” After that, many human geographers in Japan, Korea, China, and Vietnam gathered at this institute, and joint studies and intense and sometimes heated discussion took place. The final conclusions of this project were as follows: (1) East Asian traditional geography, that is, the idea of feng shui, has been adopted to settlement and house-building in southern regions of China, Korea and Okinawa; (2) Asian peoples’ views and understanding of the world were expanded by the acceptance of European geography; (3) the geography of colonized countries was modernized by the influence of the geographical thought of their colonial suzerains; (4) research by European geographers on the matter of Asian agriculture in the colonial era lacks the benefit of a native understanding of rice cultivation; and (5) geography education at universities in East Asia is generally based on European or American methods, and the contribution of geography to national planning depends on the significance of this work.

The most recent national institute in an area related to geography, the Research Institute for Humanity and Nature (RIHN), was established in 2001 by the Government of Japan to promote “integrated cooperative research toward the solution of global environmental problems” and to create the field of global environmental studies. At RIHN, concepts, theories, and mechanisms capable of describing and enabling the transformation of human-environment interactions are sought. RIHN research is increasingly transdisciplinary: geographers including Nonaka, Ikeguchi, Okamoto, Taniguchi, and Yoshikoshi have contributed to projects like “A Trans-Disciplinary Study on Regional Eco-History in Tropical Monsoon Asia: 1945–2005” and “Human Impacts on Urban Subsurface Environments.” The former research was conducted in the Mekong Valley, specifically in Southwest China, Laos, and Vietnam (Akimichi 2007; Akimichi 2008; Daniels 2008; Kono 2008). This region has experienced dramatic changes in political regimes, devastating wars, modernization, economic globalization, and population growth, all of which have affected local environments and human populations. The project developed almost 100 flow charts illustrating these processes and their effects. This eco-historical model can be expected to be extensively applicable in the analysis of local and global environmental problems.

The latter project’s goals were to evaluate the subsurface environments of seven Asian coastal cities for such problems as subsidence, groundwater contamination, and subsurface warming, and to suggest how they could be addressed or avoided. This project was therefore designed to identify groundwater recharge rates, storage, redox and other natural subsurface capacities in
Tokyo, Osaka, Seoul, Taipei, Bangkok, Jakarta, and Manila, and to measure the pace and scale of human disturbance of subsurface environments in these cities over the past century.

The RIHN (2010) has also compiled an Encyclopedia of Global Environmental Studies (Chikyu kankōgaku jiten) to commemorate the RIHN’s 10th anniversary. This project is worth mentioning for its forward-thinking integration of the humanities and the sciences and for its use of global systems thinking in the analysis of empirical data.

III Asia Area Study Group of the Human Geographical Society of Japan and other discussions on area studies

The Asia Area Study Group was established in 2000 under the auspices of the Human Geographical Society of Japan. It is the first study group that has been explicitly devoted to a specific geographical area. The aims of this group are as follows: 1) to conduct and discuss Asian area studies on economies, societies, politics, culture, and history. The main target regions are East, Southeast, and South Asia, as well as the Pacific Ocean; members with expertise in these regions discuss salient issues and appropriate research methods using first-hand data and various interdisciplinary methodologies. The Study Group has four motivating principles for this activity: 1) to accumulate geographical studies on Asia; 2) to improve accountability in fieldwork; 3) to increase the awareness of human geography in the fields of international relations, cultural anthropology, and Asian history; and 4) to record senior geographers’ overseas field experiences.

The first secretary was M. Fujimaki (Ritsumeikan University) and the founding members were T. Tsukihara (Osaka City University), H. Noma (Nara Women’s University), M. Kawabata (Ryukoku University), and K. Kumagai (Ochanomizu University).

In this group sectional meeting, M. Tachimoto (1996; 2013), ex-director of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Kyoto University and the second director of the RIHN, raised important and stimulating questions on the relationship between area studies and regional geography (Tachimoto 1996; 2013). His perspective can be summarized as follows: 1) why have geography and area studies been treated as different areas of study? 2) For a long time, both geography and area studies have been concerned with geographical regions as units of study — what are the implications of this? 3) Is it possible to do “area studies” in place of “geography”? and 4) what will happen in the future of area studies?

Tachimoto’s responses to these points were as follows: 1) Area studies can be seen as an arena for interdisciplinary projects, but geographers have not entered this arena effectively. Additionally, area studies have attached weight to language, culture, and history, while the narrow-mindedness of geography had closed minds against area studies per se and against these fields. Lastly, geographers consider area studies to be a part or synonym of regional geography. 2) Tachimoto admits the advanced understanding of the hierarchy of the local unit among geographers; nevertheless, geographers have not adopted more strategic or dynamic concepts like area studies. 3) Area studies aims for holistic integration in the study of area uniqueness, ecology, socio-cultural matters, and political economy. Research collaboration is essential in this process, leading to the emergence of a “mega-big science,” or the emergence of large-scale projects with more frequency even in the liberal arts.

There are three types of integration that need to be considered here: 1) integration among adjacent disciplines; 2) integration between the humanities, social sciences, and natural science;
and integration between the study of different areas. These processes can be seen as analogous to drawing a mandala on a canvas. It is only after the implementation of methods of study and analysis of these results, that a base unit differentiable from others, or an “area,” appears. In other words, the idea that geography equals area studies leads us to misunderstand the “containment relationship.” For the better future of area studies, it will be preferable to avoid stabilization and institutionalization. In these circumstances, if geographers fuss over the proposition that geography education the same as regional geography, the vitality of the discipline will suffer.

In response to Tachimoto’s challenges, we cannot help admitting that the discussion on such matters seems stagnant in comparison to similar discussions in other disciplines. In human geography, area studies have remained conversations unto themselves, not strategic concepts to be applied in the study of politics or tools for integration. Contemporary area studies has highlighted on the unit of the nation-state; in the course of economic and political globalization, however, a focus on new kinds of area unit is expected. We must move beyond “the sea and the mountains” to consider boundaries, peripheral areas, watershed areas, and the international nature of social networks, as has been noted in every academic discipline today. Unfortunately we must admit honestly that geography has been trivialized, reduced to a matter of case studies, not a source of transformative ideas.

Of course, regional geography has been utilized as a tool to foster nation and state consciousness in public education ever since the Meiji era (Nakayama 2000: 209–230). Ikuta (2003: 17) points out that regional geography in Japan imported the tradition of regional studies, or Heimatkunde, from Germany. At the same time, the impact of Chinese gazetteers of the Edo period, or Han Sen Chisi (“gazetteers of feudal domains”) has also been strong. In these gazetteers, enumeration of place names, topographical features, and population formed a distinctive style of regional geography. In contrast, the impact of American academic research trends was insignificant until the 1950s in geography education as well as academic (research) geography in Japan.

To summarize, geography has taken a negative stance toward describing areas against criticism of its non-scientific nature. Reflecting the inclination of Japanese human geography to involvement in geopolitics during the war period, the field has striven to adhere to an ethic of value-neutral science since the 1950s. Some geographers had actively participated in joint research, the regional geography field has not engaged with area studies.

Certainly, it must be allowed that so far, internationally, the various definitions of “area studies,” “regional geography,” and “geography” as a whole have attracted mostly ambiguity and fruitless arguments. United States strategic foreign policy has completely changed since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the decommunization of the former communist world; and the methods, aims, and nature of “area studies” have changed accordingly, in Japan as well.

On top of all this, the Study Group reviewed and discussed past achievements in the field and their implications. For example, they interviewed senior geographers who had conducted fieldwork in Asia going back to the 1960s, including K. Sasaki (who worked East, Southeast and South Asia) or A. Takahashi and H. Umehara (1992; 1999) (in the Philippines, as members of the Institute of Developing Economies). Also deserving of mention is a Hiroshima University group for India studies, initiated by J. Yonekura and benefiting from contributions from H. Ishida, K. Fujiwara, S. Nakayama, K. Kitagawa, M. Murakami, and H. Okahashi and N. Tomozawa. In addition, scholars of the younger generation, such as Araki and Minamino, learned the culture, ideas, and
methods of field study as graduate students.

The physical geographer M. Oya studied in South Korea, Thailand, Bangladesh, and the Philippines in the field of applied geographical research based on flood classification maps. T. Oda, Y. Sueo, and A. Terasaka, who graduated from Kyoto University, talked about their field experiences in Southwest Asia and Turkey from the 1960s to the 1990s, and M. Hirado (see Hirado 1998) talked about the experience of conducting survey research in rural Malaysia. In addition, a group of scholars who were alumni of Rissho University conducted research in China and on Jeju Island in South Korea. To do so, they took advantage of the social networks of Korean and Chinese students who had graduated from Rissho University in pre-war times.

H. Kono, who has been a tireless advocate of Japan-China ties through the Sino-Japan Friendship Association, also helped bridge the gap between geography researchers in Japan and China. After Kono, H. Ishihara and M. Akiyama founded the Geographical Society of Japan-China.

Further, J. Kawakita, J. Ohshima, and K. Iwata engaged in a three-way conversation on fieldwork in the early days after World War II in Nepal as well as Laos and other Southeast Asian countries. S. Higuchi studied Korean rice research and the Japanese urban landscape in South Korea.

All these interviews were funded by a JSPS scientific grant for the establishment of a “Database on Asian Area Study and Construction of Researchers’ Academic Network Focused on Geography” (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) 2002–2003, Project no. 14390035, head investigator: H. Noma) and conducted with the collaboration of the Asian study group.

Similarly, Fujita (1994; 1995; 1998; 2002; 2012) compiled descriptions of the great journeys in and around China by Toa Dobun Shoin students. This private collage was established in Shanghai in 1901 with the support of the Japanese government in order to train Japanese private-sector managers in China. Huge volumes of students’ journey reports were used for intelligence in China later on (Fujita 2000; 2011; 2012), and they remain valuable for the information they can give on the image of the region held by these Japanese expatriates.

IV Trends in Japanese geographical research on East Asia since the 1980s

Since the “reform and opening” declaration of 1978, China’s economy has continuously achieved remarkable growth, becoming the “factory of the world.” The revival of physical geography came first in China, but Kono (1989) warned the only focus on economic geography revival for human geography. He also pointed out the separation of historical and contemporary geography, and the importance of map-reading education in the future. Finally, Kono pointed out that cooperation between geographers and the fields of sociology, folklore, and cultural anthropology is weak in the Chinese context. Chinese geographers share concern about the rampant over-cultivation and over-grazing and reckless deforestation of their country since the Cultural Revolution and the advent of the emphasis on cereal agriculture. Y. Abe (2007) has reviewed and discussed the human-land relationship in China before the Chinese Geographical Society.

In the 1980s, “township enterprises” (gochin kigyo) arose in rural China and became the driving force of the country’s massive economic growth (Ueno ed. 1993; Kitamura ed. [2000] has also reported on the situation of these enterprises). Next, in the 1990s, foreign-owned companies began to expand operations into China in a big way in search of a cheap and reliable production base. Reform of state-owned and collective enterprises led to major growth in the 2000s, becoming the “engine
of growth” (Teng 2001).

Kawabata visited Japanese firms in China (1996; 2006) and Southeast Asia (2005), interviewed key personnel, and surveyed local markets. Beijing and Shanghai are important economic areas in China, with a longstanding Japanese presence, especially of Japanese department stores. From the late 1980s until the early 1990s, Japanese firms advanced aggressively into China (Kawabata 2006) and Southeast Asian countries (Kawabata 2005) in a process of overseas transfer for cost reduction in manufacturing. Sales in China were less of a focus, and were left to trading companies; however, these retailers have struggled due to insufficient investigation and understanding of consumer trends in China. Arai et al. (2008) have described the life space in Chinese cities, Araki and Chai (2004) have analyzed the wholesale market in Beijing, afterward he has written the fresh vegetable wholesale market in Asia (Araki 2008).

Another research trend to be noted is that of research on the Chinese diaspora (Yamashita 2000; Izumida 2006). Yamashita, who has studied Yokohama’s Chinatown, is a pioneer in this area; additionally, Sekido and Yu (2001) analyzed changes in the lifestyles of overseas as well as ethnic Chinese. Yamashita (2008) has surveyed the present state of ethnic Chinese in other Asian countries, such as Laos (2006) and South Korea (2001). Additionally, Yamashita and others investigated the relationships of overseas Chinese to their ancestral hometowns in Fujian Province (Yamashita 2002, Yamashita et al. 2010) and tried to chart their strong, global human networks. (Yamashita 2000; 2008). One hub of diaspora Chinese is Ikebukuro in Tokyo, which differs from older Chinatowns as a “newcomers’” rather than an “oldcomers’” area (Yamashita 2010). Finally, Yamashita (Yamashita; 2005) is a collection of information on Chinese settlements around the world.

Several monographs written in Japanese have been produced by Japanese or Chinese geographers on the geographical transformation of districts or provinces in China. The economic disparity between eastern, coastal regions and the northeastern and western regions has expanded drastically for the last 30 years, as has the gap between the cities and rural areas, giving rise not only to economic but also to political and social issues (Kojima 1999; 2003; Chen 2011; Onodera 1997; 2002; Jin 2004; Jin 2007; Jin 2010). Further, a group of scholars from Uchiyama and Rissho Universities (2001) investigated the degree of development of the Changjian basin.

Okuno (2004) has highlighted how films produced in Hong Kong have faithfully recorded changes in the cityscape accompanying various phases in the shift from British colony to Chinese Special Administrative Region (SAR), with attention to the key role of Hong Kong film stars, directors, and choreographers in exploring the nature of Chinese identity.

Next, we will consider some comprehensive studies on topics relating to human geography (as well as other types) in East and Southeast Asia done by Japanese geographers since 1980. Most are fieldwork oriented, covering topics such as the geography of Jeju Island (by a Rissho University group; Takano 1996); China’s reform, the opening up of coastal areas, and changes in industrial structure (e.g., Ueno 1993; Kitamura 2000; Uchiyama 2001); and climate change and desertification in China (Yoshino 1997). Ishihara has organized several investigation groups under the auspices of JSPS with the collaboration of local universities in China, for example in the city of Zhegzhou and Henan province (2003), Sichuan Province (2010; Imazato 2001) and in Northwest China (2011). These studies analyzed features like rural settlements, changes in the market system, industrial locations, and transformation of urban structures, through interviews, statistical data, and field observations. Locations in tropical China, such as Hainan and Yunnan provinces, have been studied by Shirasaka (2004) and Yoshino (1993; 1997; 1999; 1997) Kayane (2005) has compiled the
environmental issues in China as the 21st Century Center of Excellence Program.

Outside China, Kitada (2000) has considered a clear difference in transport structures between Taiwan and Korea. In Korea, short railway lines linking established large cities in the interior of the country with new port cities, are common. Kim (1995) investigated depopulated areas in South Korea, and Lee (1997) analyzed dam construction and clan responses to it in South Korea. J-H. Park (1997) and C. Park (1999) elucidated the export activities of firms in Busan in relation to Japan in terms of actual physical distribution, focusing especially on the port of Shimonoseki, which firms in Pusan frequently use as a gateway to Japan.

Wada (2007) compare the culture of (food) nuts and their methods of processing in Japan and South Korea from the point of view of cultural geography. Similarly, Yu (2005) compares the shape, ingredients, and cultural role of dumplings (gyoza) in Shanen province. Asano et. al. (2008; 2001) have treated the environmental issed in the final land in South Korea.

The COE (Center of Excellence) program, a massive research and education effort, has launched the East Asia Global COE program at the University of Tokyo, Waseda University, Kansai University, Gakushuin University, and Kyushu University in the last decade, with a large budget. and the accumulation of material, approach from the periphery in East Asia, China ocean example of human geography went positively commit itself to such movement of people globally found emphasis on, in Chinese, overseas Chinese studies is small. Ogata (2000) studied historical ruins by satellite photos environmental changes and inland China.

New methodological trends in human geography and cultural geography were applied to subcultures in East Asia (Okuno 2004; Yamamoto 2009). Okuno considered the Hong Kong film industry in terms of “filmspace” and globalization of the subculture, while Yamamoto analyzed the growth of the animation industry in Shanghai. Finally, Chu and Kagawa (2009) studied spatial differences between creative industrial zones in Shanghai.

As for Taiwan, Yo (1994, 2010) analyzed urban planning in Taipei in terms of gendered spaces.

V  Trends in research on Southeast Asia since the 1980s

One remarkable research trend in human geography and Southeast Asian Studies in Japan since the 1980s is that minorities and poverty have become important matters. Fujimaki (2009) considers the situation in this regard in Kuala Lumpur, and Kumagai considers slum and squatter settlements in Jakarta. Ikuta et al. (2000) and Ikuta (2002) look at urban development in Kuala Lumpur and Malaysia in more general terms.

Since the 1990s, poverty alleviation has been less emphasized in research in the area as they have become more economically developed and globalized, a process that has extended to remote areas. Yamamura looks at fishing villages in Southeast Asia, and Soda (1999; 2007) at rural-urban migration of the Iban people in Sarawak, Malaysia. He employs three approaches: setting a broad study area including a local center and its hinterland; focusing on people who continuously move between rural and urban areas and thus efface the rural/urban distinction; and reconsidering the traditional bias to “sedentarism,” which has led us to regard rural communities as stable and unmoving.

Tourism research became a major area of growth in the 1990s. Fujimaki and Eguchi (2009) compiled a good anthology on Asian tourism under globalization. Yokoyama (2007) describes a backpacker enclave in Laos, and Noma (2008) studies rice terrace farmers of the Ifugao people and the drastic change in their economic conditions after the establishment of a UNESCO
World Heritage Site in their lands. Also studied have been hill stations like Sapa in Vietnam (Vu 2010) and the Cameron highlands in Malaysia (Shirasaka 2009). Alternative tourism has boomed in Southeast Asia, and Japanese human geographers have also become involved in this area.

A project in the village of Don Daeng in Northeast Thailand, following up on a study conducted by Mizuno, has been presented in two books (Fukui 1986; Kuchiba 1990). Since then, 20 years after the original project, a new interdisciplinary project has been launched by organization members, meaning that the village has now been studied over a period of 40 years (Funahashi 2005). In Northeast Thailand, Takahashi (1997; 2001) has analyzed the demographic transition from demographic geography’s point.

In the Lao cultural region of the Mekong basin, investigation of the socialist country of Laos has been possible, although restricted. A Mekong project organized by the Earth Institute, studies the ecological history of the basin, involving research in Laos, Vietnam, Thailand, and the Yunnan region of China. Nonaka (2005a; 2005b; 2008) records the details of use of a variety of resources in a paddy rice cultivation area in Donkuwai village. Finally, loss of habitat and flora and fauna due to slash-and-burn agriculture and other practices has been studied by Yokoyama (2001b).

Map-building using GPS and satellite photos, human and animal behavioral surveys, has been quite useful in the development of the field of rural studies and the improvement of geographic information systems (GISs) (Mizushima and Shibayama ed. 2009). Change study a three-dimensional based on the history and development of GIS research methods (Shibayama 2009; Shibayama 2012) highly detailed elevation data of historical cities Hanoi was held in Hanoi this. Urban development in Hanoi since the late 19th century Hanoi is the core of the project, whose ultimate goal is the gathering of information on the Southeast Asian region by GIS. Therefore, there are funding opportunities for graduate students wishing to do research fieldwork in Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, organization issues related to reduction of the geographic knowledge of overseas study area that thought and reflection of survey methods has also become an important issue. In Laos, the Department of Geography of Nagoya University has practiced the reduction of: 1) universities and other higher education institutions and 2) elementary school students and villagers.
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東・東南アジア地域を中心とした日本の地理学研究
——1980年代以降を中心に——

野間晴雄
関西大学

日本の地理学者によるアジア研究、とりわけ東アジアと東南アジアにおける1980年代以降の研究をある程度網羅的に紹介・展望する。とりわけ、グローバル化によって、人もモノもアジア各地を流動した時代である。研究者が直接現地にいき、その国の研究者との共同研究がさかん行われた年であった。とりわけ中国やベトナムに関しては、大きく研究環境がかわり、総合的な学際的学術調査（科学研究費等による国際共同研究など）や個人などの調査も一定の手続きをふめば可能になった意義は大きい。それまでの文献を中心とした研究から、発展する中国の現状を都市・農村で把握しようとする研究が増えた。台頭する地域研究と人文地理学がどう対峙し、研究を進めてきたかの回顧と展望を試みる。国としてもアジア諸国の研究重視の流れがあり、それをうけて人文地理学会でもアジア地域研究部会が設立され、さまざまな活動を行ってきた。この流れを紹介しながら、新しい人文地理学のアジア研究の動向を環境・資源利用、ツーリズム、ポストコロニアリズム、地域間交流研究）などと、調査・分析手法の進化（GIS, GPS）を見通しながらレビューする。
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