

地域研究 専攻 領域（博士前期/修士・博士後期・前後期共通）

試験科目：第 外国語（ 英語 ） / 専門科目（ ）

試験時間：（ 60 ）分

Following is an excerpt of a paper on the critiques of area studies. Read the following passage and describe the principal issues it deals with, in your own words either in English or in Japanese. Summarize between 15 and 20 lines for English or 800 letters in Japanese.

以下は、地域研究に関する議論の一部です。次の文章を読み、この論文の趣旨を英語または日本語でまとめなさい。英語の場合は、15-20行程度、日本語の場合は800字程度とします。

A more subtle set of critiques of Area Studies scholars argues that they have absorbed and have continued to use uncritically the politically biased categories, perspectives, commitments, and theories of their colonialist scholar-administrator predecessors—or indeed, of contemporary US or Western leaders attempting to maintain or expand hegemonic control over the rest of the world. The claim, dramatically put forward by Edward Said, and echoed across Subaltern and Cultural Studies generally, is that despite Area Studies scholars' evident personal interest and specialized knowledge of the area of the world they are studying, the conceptualization of their projects, their research agendas, and what they have taken as appropriate units of analysis and relevant models of society and social change, have been fundamentally and consistently US- or Euro-centric.

In effect, there are two different charges here. One is that Area Studies scholars have sometimes or often failed to study other societies in their own terms, as social and cultural life and processes are experienced and might be construed, constructed, analyzed, and critiqued from the inside. The second is that they have failed to extract themselves from their conscious or unconscious political biases and therefore have not adequately framed their analyses in some purportedly more universal theory, whether neo-liberal, neo-Marxist, post-modern, etc. Instead, Area Studies scholars are accused of—at best, naively, at worst, intentionally—imposing their own personal and/or national agendas and variously idealized or mythologized formulations of the historical experience of "the West," both to explain, and most often in the process, to denigrate, other societies that have almost always been in one way or another, politically and economically subordinated.

Followed by the next page. 次のページに続く。

There is certainly some truth to these charges. As Michel Foucault has repeatedly reminded us, political power and position and the generation of knowledge are inevitably entwined. Area Studies, however, has no monopoly on this. As Alan Tansman and Timothy Mitchell stress, it is true of essentially all social science and humanistic research, whether conducted by insiders or outsiders. All scholars in the US or elsewhere, including the critics of Area Studies, are influenced by their political context and political commitments. The imposition of politically freighted categories and theories is unavoidable and always shapes how issues are framed, what kinds of questions are raised, what equally valid questions are ignored, and who benefits from the research. Choosing the interesting question, which elements to emphasize, how to balance them, and how to decide which is more important, will always be a matter of judgement based on the values and interests of the observer. (Indeed, as Timothy Mitchell notes in his essay, for many years the Middle East Studies Association would not allow panels on Arab-Israeli relations because no one could be expected to "be objective" about the issues.) But this is equally true for the insider, or the outsider looking in; power and perspective will always shape the generation of social knowledge.

Given, however, the current economic and political hegemony of the US as the world's sole "superpower," the research assumptions, concepts, procedures and funding of US scholars, often seem overbearing or irresistible. They also often provoke deep cultural and political resentments (and sometimes alternative analytic formulations) in other parts of the world. Nevertheless, Area Studies scholars have perhaps one advantage in dealing with this problem. Intensive, research conducted outside of one's home country, in a setting which in various ways is unfamiliar, is at least somewhat more conducive to disruptive self-consciousness about these issues than research conducted in the familiar and seemingly "natural" US. And a self-conscious attempt to articulate as clearly as possible the commitments, perspectives, and power relations one brings to one's research, is perhaps the best that any scholar can do.

Szanton. David L., 2004, "Introduction: The Origin, Nature, and Challenges of Area Studies in the United States," In David Szanton ed., *The Politics of Knowledge: Area Studies and the Disciplines*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 22-24.

Note: Some content was changed for the exam. 出題にあたり、本文を一部変更した。

地域研究 専攻 _____ 領域（ 博士前期/修士 ・博士後期・前後期共通 ）

試験科目：第 外国語（フランス語） / 専門科目（ _____ ）

試験時間：（ 60 ）分

次の文章を読み、日本語に訳しなさい。

Mathieu Guidere, Atlas des pays arabes (Autrement), 2025, p52-53