DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 827 FL 020 856

TITLE	National Target for South Asia Specialists. A Report.
INSTITUTION	National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	[92]
NOTE	78p.; Some tables may not reproduce legibly.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Studies; *Demand Occupations; Foreign Countries; International Studies; Knowledge Level; *Language Proficiency; *Non Western Civilization; *Occupational Information; Position Papers; *Second Language Learning; Trend Analysis; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Asia (South)

ABSTRACT

The South Asia Panel of the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies reports on the need for specialists in the languages and cultures of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, and the Maldives. Two categories of specialists are discussed: (1) individuals in government, mission, etc., in mission-oriented occupations, who spend a substantial portion of their professional time dealing with one or more of the countries in South Asia; and (2) "knowledge producers," largely academics who specialize in the countries of South Asia and who bring their knowledge to the attention of practitioners and the general public. This paper first describes types of jobs that require expertise about South Asia, and then considers the kinds of knowledge now being produced by American scholars. Types of competencies needed to create and sustain the knowledge required by U.S. national interest is specified. A long-term goal is recommended for a complement of fully trained language and area-competent people in various mission-oriented occupational roles. Short- and mid-term goals for language and area proficiency are also identified. Using language ability as a surrogate for these combined linguistic, social, and cultural skills, the Panel sets up four categories: maximum (Foreign Service Institute levels 4 and 5), high (Level 3), medium (level 2), and low (levels 1 and 0). For example, an agronomist doing village work would require maximum language and area skills. Difficulties with attrition in the field are addressed, and the need for a better overall correlation between specialist development and occupational placement is examined. Two appendixes provide charts describing the distribution of work by subdiscipline and geographic area. (Contains 13 tables.) (LB)

NATIONAL TARGET FOR SOUTH ASIA SPECIALISTS

A REPORT TO

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Committee Members for the South Asia Panel:

Richard D. Lambert, Chairman
University of Pennsylvania

Craig Baxter, Co-Chairman
McLean, Virginia

Edward Dimock
University of Chicago

Ainslee T. Embree
Columbia University

Warren Ilchman
State University of New York
at Albany

Phillips Talbot
The Asia Society

Lawrence Veit
Brown Brothers, Harriman

Myron Weiner
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Sarah Jane Moore, Staff
University of Pennsylvania

NATIONAL TARGETS FOR SOUTH ASIA SPECIALISTS

It is axiomatic that the United States needs knowledge in depth about an area of the world that contains more than one-fifth of the world's population--South Asia. We include in this area Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bhutan and the Maldives. The arenas of importance of South Asia to the United States range from the strategic--South Asia juts deeply into the Indian Ocean, its northern portion borders on China and the Soviet Union, and its Islamic western portion stretches into the Persian Gulf; to the economic--India is the 14th largest manufacturing nation in the world today and we increasingly find the products of its modern technology in the international marketplace along side of our own; to the humanistic--it is the birthplace or a major center of three major religious systems and its arts, music and literature have enriched our own cultural heritage.

We are herein concerned with the existing and the ideal pools of competencies which the United States should maintain both to carry out its diverse relations with the countries of South Asia and to extend and deepen our knowledge in general so that our policies may be informed and our society as a whole understand better this important part of the world. The first of these pools of competencies lies in education, and comprises individuals in government, missions, etc., who spend a substantial portion of their professional time dealing with one or more of the countries of South Asia. They

tend not to be studying, teaching or writing about these countries; rather, they represent the domain of their activities. We will refer to them as mission oriented occupations. The second is largely, but not entirely, populated by academics for whom the countries of South Asia are the object of their scholarly activities. They are the producers of general and specialized knowledge about these countries and the teachers and authors who bring this knowledge to the attention of the practitioners and the general public. We will refer to them as knowledge producers. The two categories are, of course, not mutually exclusive and there is a fair amount of overlap and movement back and forth between the two, but the types and levels of skill demanded and the nature of the professional concern with South Asia is sufficiently different that they require separate and different consideration.

We will deal with these two purposes in the order indicated, that is, we will first attempt to classify and enumerate the different kinds of jobs, largely non-academic, that require various amounts of area and language expertise with reference to South Asia. Second, we will consider the kinds of knowledge about South Asia now being produced by American scholars, attempt to identify a sub-set of these producers who have genuine expertise on South Asia, and from there proceed to specify the pools of competencies needed to create and sustain the knowledge which our national interest requires.

Specifying the need for language and area expertise for different occupational roles is especially complex for South Asia. For many of these roles technical and vocational competence obviously come first, and relatively few people will be assigned to South Asia for more than a small segment of their professional lives. Moreover, in many areas--especially in science, business and economics--it is still possible to "do business" in English or to work through local intermediaries. And the number of languages

spoken in the region is so great that no one can master all or most of them. Nonetheless, we believe that increasingly, full effectiveness in dealing with South Asia will be dependent upon having a working ability to speak and read one or more of the languages of the area. In fact, we believe that limiting direct communication to the English speaking elites is already hampering many missions. It is perhaps difficult to make a persuasive case that all individuals in the cadre of Americans serving in South Asia need to know a South Asian language, but the collective effect of staffing overseas offices almost entirely with Americans who are limited to English and who must deal through an English-speaking set of local intermediaries, is unfortunate, to say the least. This may as yet be less true in India and Sri Lanka, but in Bangladesh, Afghanistan and Nepal, the handicap of English monolingualism is immense and in Pakistan it is fast becoming so. Another brief generation and the cost of monolingualism will be great in India and Sri Lanka as well. And what is true of language is equally true for cultural and social knowledge.

Accordingly, we herein make a recommendation for a complement of fully trained language and area competent people in various mission-oriented occupational roles realizing that in many cases this is a long-term target. For each occupational category, then, we will also comment on more realistic, short and mid-term goals for language and area proficiency. Using language ability as a surrogate for these combined linguistic, social and cultural skills we have set up four categories: maximum (Foreign Service Institute level 4 and 5), high (level 3), medium (level 2) and low (level 1 and 0). For example, an agronomist doing village level work would require maximum language and area skills; a political officer working on internal politics,

high; an economic development specialist, medium; and a sales engineer based in the United States or a meteorologist working with Indian scientists in a short-term cooperative project, low.

Science and Technology

Scientific and technological relations with the sub-continent have expanded considerably in the past twenty or so years. Following on earlier private cooperation, the extension of the uses of P.L. 480 currencies to include science and technology through appropriations to scientific agencies of the United States Government for use in India and Pakistan has been the primary factor in this expansion. For example, in fiscal year 1979, 159 new projects were undertaken (105 in India and 54 in Pakistan) utilizing these currencies for cooperative projects between South Asian scientists on the one hand and, on the other, U.S. agencies or individual scientists receiving grants from U.S. agencies. The use of the currencies is governed, in addition to U.S. government appropriation measures and agency regulations, by agreements with the two South Asian countries. In the case of India, these are the agreements setting up the U.S.-India Joint Commission and its Subcommission on Science and Technology, which meets annually, and a series of memoranda of understanding between U. S. and Indian agencies. With Pakistan, no overall agreement has been concluded but memoranda of understanding exist.

The result has been that there is a large number of American scientists who have experience of research in India with Indian counterparts and similarly in Pakistan. The 1979 figure mentioned above is, following the pattern over earlier years, dominated by several agencies: Agriculture (27), Health, Education and Welfare (51), National Science Foundation (21), and

Smithsonian Institution (38). Agriculture and NSF publish annual listings of the grants and the former also publishes a cumulative listing of all projects under P.L. 480. For more recent years, an annual survey has been taken by the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs of the Department of State, the agency charged with general oversight of official U.S. scientific activities overseas.

It is difficult to determine a specific minimum requirement for scientists other than to note that they should have, in addition to their disciplinary skills, a secondary skill in South Asian aspects of their discipline. However, a substantial inventory of scientists and of research publications exists and will continue to exist as long as programs under P.L. 480 are capable of funding under U.S. law and the two South Asian countries in which these can be used are willing to continue programs. Under present law, P.L. 480 sales are, with some exceptions, no longer repayable in local currency. Nonetheless, stocks of Indian and Pakistani rupees are sufficient for continuation of programs at least through the eighties.

Within the U.S. Government the management and oversight of the programs undertaken by the agencies in South Asia require individuals who have specialized knowledge of the countries and of their administrative and scientific structures. These skills will necessarily be combined with other skills so that only in a few cases will budgetary limitations and personnel ceilings as well as activity permit assignment of a full-time employe to South Asian scientific activities. Demand would appear to be that shown in Table I.

TABLE I

	Positions	People
Department of State		
Science Counselor, New Delhi	1	1
OES	½	1
Department of Agriculture	1	2
National Science Foundation	1	1
Department of Health and Human Services	1	2
Agency for International Development		
Supervision of science & technology activities	2	2
Field Assignment	2	2

A further note is that the State and AID positions are Foreign Service and therefore rotational. For example, currently the area of responsibility for the OES officer is the Near East, South Asia and Africa; officers filling the position may be drawn from among specialists on any of the areas. Language requirements for all positions can be rated at low to medium.

Public Policy and Business

The United States Government will require a substantial number of persons trained in South Asia in fulfillment of diplomatic, economic, cultural, educational military and intelligence activities. Other clientele which can be considered under this heading are international organizations, state and local governments and business firms.

It is perhaps best to begin with the requirements of the principal agency involved in international affairs, the Department of State. However, in doing so an important point must be made. Officers in the Department of State, the United States International Communications Agency (ICA), the Agency for International Development (AID), the military, and presumably the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) rarely spend all of their careers in a single area and are often transferred not only between Washington and the field but also

to other functional specializations and other geographic areas. Thus, ideally, the supply of South Asian specialists should exceed the identifiable demand in Washington and abroad to permit "excursion" tours of the personnel concerned.

Table II shows the number of area trained specialists each of the principal agencies requires. State and ICA have overseas certain "language designated slots" to which, if possible and practicable, persons with high language training should be assigned. For State these are most often political and economic officers; for ICA, cultural and information officers. Many other positions should also be staffed with persons at the high language level or, at a minimum, medium. The figures of AID assume resumption of interrupted programs. To carry out the requirements effectively an addition of about 20% should be added to cover excursion tours and other factors taking a trained person from the area, an optimum total therefore of about 157. The skills for South Asia must, of course, be accompanied by traditional vocational skills. The employing agency is most likely to consider the latter primary and the area skills secondary. The languages needed are Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Tamil, Sinhala, and Dari with secondary requirements for Pushto, Nepali and Marathi. Training would be given at the Foreign Service Institute, with a South Asian linguist needed.

TABLE II

	State	ICA	AID	TOTAL
Washington				
"Desk"	11	4	5	20
Research	3	1	-	4
Field:				
India	13	15	6	34
Bangladesh	3	2	9	14
Nepal	2	2	4	8
Sri Lanka	2	2	2	6
Pakistan	9	8	14	31
Afghanistan	6	2	6	14
	49	36	46	131

The Department of Commerce and the newly created Foreign Commercial Service as well as the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) also require persons with South Asian area skills. For Commerce and the FCS three based in Washington can work with three based in the field, two in New Delhi and one in Islamabad. FAS requires five (New Delhi two, and one each in Bombay, Islamabad and Dacca) and perhaps two in Washington. Low level language skills would be sufficient.

The military requirements are substantial as long as the present combined defense attache system remains. Specialization for the Army was formerly acquired through the Foreign Area Specialization Program (FASP) but for the Navy and the Air Force less training was given. Positions in the combined system (assuming a restoration in Afghanistan) are ten or eleven in the field and five in the Defence Intelligence Agency. The International Security Agency in the Office of the Secretary of Defence requires two, one each for India and Pakistan with the other countries as additional duties for these two. Language skills are not required except for Afghanistan and possibly Bangladesh, but are, of course, a valuable additional skill. Requirements for CIA are difficult to estimate but two dozen or more in Langley and perhaps another two dozen in the field is hazarded as a guess. A position in the National Security Council staff is also needed. A minimum of three in the Library of Congress, preferably with high language skills, and one in the Congressional Research Staff is needed. Other agencies would normally look to State for area skills when those were needed for a specific purpose.

The total of the above U.S. Government requirements is about 225, a figure which may be unrealistic in budgetary terms but are modest estimates in terms of the national interest.

State and local governments often have groups which explore avenues for export and channels for investment. It is unlikely that any group would require a full-time person to work on South Asia, as might be the case, for example, with Europe, the Far East or the Middle East. More likely these groups would look to the federal government, consulting firms or academic sources for highly specialized area information, depending otherwise on the trade program skills in the organization.

Consulting firms at present appear to have little expertise in South Asia, whether these be broadly based management firms or specialized engineering and similar firms. It would seem that there is a need but one which would be difficult for a firm to justify filling with a full-time South Asia specialist. That there is a long-range potential for expanded trade with investment in South Asia is probably a true statement, but one which is hedged with political and economic factors. It is possible that the next decade will see a demand for as many as 20 area specialists carefully placed in consulting firms to serve the needs of businesses requiring information on the area. Language skills, if needed, would in most cases be at the low level. Political, administrative, economic, commercial, and cultural knowledge would be essential.

Individual business firms would be expected to look toward the consulting firms in most cases, although a few would need specialists on the staff. Principal among these are the major banks with offices in South Asia. With the increase in locally recruited managers, the number required would be smaller but would still be eight or ten. Insurance companies and groups might add another two. Study of the organization and operation of South Asian business has been neglected and universities might need four, plus three more on labor, three on law, and three on taxes.

Language requirements are apt to be overlooked by employers, but, for persons resident in South Asia, the medium level is needed.

The requirements of voluntary agencies and church groups are difficult to measure. In the former, although often some training is given before an assignment, much of the early period is a training experience, and often leads to filling other positions earlier mentioned, e.g., Peace Corps volunteers entering the Foreign Service. Mission groups clearly have a need for specialized training, particularly in language skills. The number of American missionaries in the area is decreasing but we do not have a reliable estimate of the number presently in the field or of those backing them up at home.

Journalism is an area in which pre-assignment area training has, with some notable exceptions, generally been neglected. On the other hand, many useful books and articles have been written during and following assignments by journalists. The American foreign correspondent corps in South Asia in "normal" times is perhaps six, each of whom should be trained in South Asia although the skills will be increasingly important and a medium level in Hindi will be necessary.

The number of Americans in the international agencies is subject to agreements. We cannot closely estimate the proportion of those who might work on South Asia but experience seems to indicate that among those with South Asian assignments perhaps as many as 25 would be American.

The paragraphs above, following the estimated requirements for the United States Government, are necessarily less precise but the total is in the range of 70-75, excluding the volunteer agencies and mission groups.

Knowledge Producers

Although the government and private economic sectors are important, it is in the academic world that the largest number of specialists producing systematic knowledge on the area must be found. We do not mean to suggest that important knowledge about the countries of South Asia is not being produced outside the scholarly world--indeed it is unfortunate that so little of the information generated by the business and the mission-oriented government agencies is fed into the scholarly world and the society at large. However, in our society, limitations of time, immediacy, and assignment put the emphasis among "practitioners" on accomplishing a specific task rather than adding to our public store of knowledge about another country. It is primarily in the scholarly world that the resources and skills for basic research are found, resources which are not in demand on a full-time basis elsewhere but which are critical for the maintenance of the in depth knowledge of South Asia which is needed. Moreover, in addition to research and dissemination of findings, it is in the universities that the fresh cadres of specialists are trained to fill the requirements of the other sectors and to replace the loss through attrition in all sectors.

From the perspective of the American national interest, of course, the point of language and area studies is the knowledge it produces. Scholars are the most important element in the production of that knowledge, but an analysis of how well national interest is being served and what its needs will be in the future should start with a look at the number and the distribution of American scholars who have recently produced knowledge about South Asia in various fields. We will take a cross-sectional look at what is and is not being attended to and make some comments on important gaps and imbalances. Then we can turn to the number and distribution of highly

trained and experienced professionals who will form the core group producing knowledge in the future, once again noting important gaps and imbalances.

Table III (page 13) indicates the number and disciplinary or topical focus of American or U.S.-resident scholars who have (1) published, (2) given papers, (3) written doctoral dissertations, or (4) held overseas research fellowships on South Asia as indicated in the following sources: Journal of Asian Studies Annual Bibliography for 1975 and 1976 (the last two years available); the Annual Meetings of the American Association for Asian Studies from 1965 to 1980, and the American Oriental Society (1979-80); fellowships granted by the American Institute of Indian Studies from 1962-1980, the American Institute of Pakistan Studies from 1974-1980, and the ACLS-SSRC Joint Committee on South Asia from 1975-1979; and Dissertations on Asia for the years 1971-1977. We regret that shortage of time and funds did not permit us to make the coverage more comprehensive nor to gauge trends over time.

Individuals in the first set of tabulations will appear according to the discipline and topical focus of their publication, paper, dissertation or overseas research, not the discipline with which they identify themselves. The detailed tables given in Appendix A present these data, giving the number of scholars who appear on one of these lists by discipline, sub-discipline and geographic focus. An individual is counted only once within each cell, that is, if he has published, given a paper, had a fellowship and written a dissertation on a particular topic, he would be counted only once under that rubric. If he has researched, written or spoken on several topics, he will appear in each appropriate cell.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF SOUTH ASIANISTS IN 1980 AND 1970

	1980		1970	
	number	percent	estimated number	percent
Anthropology/Sociology	363	18.8	147	15.0
Archaeology	46	2.4	-	-
Art (Visual)	137	7.1	19	1.9
Art (performing)	79	4.1	8	0.8
Communication & Media	18	0.9	-	-
Economics	113	5.8	87	8.9
Education	54	2.8	28	2.9
Geography	107	5.5	40	4.1
History	268	13.9	198	20.2
Language and Linguistics	118	6.1	81	8.3
Library & Bibliography	38	2.0	-	-
Literature	122	6.3	53	5.4
Political Science	242	12.5	181	18.5
Religion and Philosophy	155	8.0	123	12.6
Science and Technology	72	3.7	15	1.5
Totals	1932	100.0	980	100.0

To indicate the amount of overlap involved in the various counting procedures, if we sum all individuals producing scholarship in any category, allowing full double counting, we will have 3220 persons. If we permit an individual to appear only once in each discipline or topical area, we enumerate 2076 individuals. If we allow individuals to appear only once anywhere on the list, we will have 1932 different individuals. If we take only those who are judged by their peers to be full professional language and area specialists we will have 762. And if we take only those who also have a reputation for possessing a genuine language competency, we will have only 544 specialists. The tables at various levels of detail and degree of overlap give us a picture of the aggregate distribution of the research effort of American scholarship on South Asia.

Let us begin with several summary tables. In these tables, the data have been compressed so that multiple listings of the same individual within a single discipline or topical area have been deleted. Hence, the aggregate totals have the minimum of double counting. They are still, however, by topic of project, paper or publication, not necessarily the author's home discipline, since at this stage we are interested in how many scholars are contributing to the various realms of knowledge, not discrete individuals.

The first two columns of Table III indicate by discipline the number and proportion of people so enumerated. The last two columns reproduce equivalent data collected in 1970 for the Language and Area Studies Review.[1] The forms of data collection differ substantially. The 1970 study measured the body of specialists at a particular period of time, and it was done by questionnaire so that some self-identification was involved. The current study takes data over a span of years, and includes people because of their scholarly product. It represents no self-identification and necessarily

inflates the true figure since a single dissertation, book, article or fellowship is enough to get someone included, whether or not he or she remains in the field or, indeed, sees himself or herself as a part of it. However, since both attempt to determine the disciplinary complement in the universe of specialists, a comparison of the proportional distributions, if not the absolute figures, can be enlightening.

There is some evidence that even the absolute figures may not be very far off. In the 1970 Language and Area Studies Review it was estimated that there were 1059 South Asia specialists;[2] our 1980 count puts the total at 1932. Barber and Ilchman[3] estimated that in 1979 there were 2800 South and Southeast Asia specialists. If we use the same ratio of two South to one Southeast Asian specialist as obtained in 1970 this would give about 1900 specialists, not too far below our own estimate. We are here, however, more interested in the proportional distribution among the disciplines and in some of the particular specialities within those disciplines where very few scholars are found. At the very low levels, the absolute figures given are probably sufficient.

The overall impression from Table III is one of stability, particularly in comparing the proportional distributions in columns 2 and 4. In the current study, as in the 1970 study, the majority (56.1%) are found in the traditional language and area studies disciplines: history, language and literature, political science and anthropology/sociology--these two disciplines are impossible to separate in South Asian studies, as are religion and philosophy. If one adds economics to the four core disciplines, the proportion increases to two-thirds (66.5%) of all scholars. The predominance of the core disciplines was even stronger in 1970--67.3% for history, language and literature, political science and anthropology/sociology and 76.2% if one adds economics.

Within the core disciplines there have been some interesting shifts. The relative importance of history and political science have declined somewhat and in language studies there is a slight shift from linguistic studies of the language per se to literature, a sign of maturation of the discipline. What is even more important, and it is difficult to judge whether this is an artifact of the different methods of data collection, is the broadening of the disciplinary span since 1970 to include the arts, both visual and performing, and scholars in applied fields such as education, communications and science and technology. While these disciplines still represent only a small minority (7.8%) of all specialists, they are a welcome addition. Indeed it is they, more than the social scientists and humanists, who provide knowledge that is of direct relevance to government and business clienteles.

Sub-fields of Specialization

The broad disciplinary rubrics are really too gross to show the important substantive gaps in coverage which the decentralized, laissez-faire system of selection of research subjects has created. Some idea of this may be had by breaking down each discipline into its primary sub-divisions. Appendix A presents the number of scholars reported working in each sub-field. It will be recalled that a scholar whose work spans several sub-fields will be enumerated in each. The detail in the table can be extremely helpful in setting future research priorities for the field but here it is useful to note within each discipline those subjects that seem to be both important for national policy and disproportionately underrepresented.

Taking the disciplines in order, in anthropology/sociology, social psychological studies, particularly studies of attitudes, personality and values of South Asians, would seem to be of major importance to a study of

these societies, and extremely important for our relations with them, but they are poorly represented. The same can be said for studies of social conflict--vital to our understanding of future political stability; and studies of work attitudes and behavior and labor relations which should be important to businessmen and others dealing with the economics of South Asia. Among the arts, there is a curious lack of attention to the cinema, although India in particular has the second largest production of and probably the largest attendance at movies of any country. Moreover, the study of the cinema is the high road into popular beliefs and aspirations. This neglect of the movies is part of a general tendency to study only the traditional art forms, indeed, the traditional high culture of the society in general, rather than modern "corrupt" beliefs and practices. This aside, the growth in the study of the arts represents an important advance in our cultural links with South Asia.

Studies of communication seem to be concentrated on the press--and the English language press at that. Surely one of our important national interests is much more effective coverage of the vernacular press, television, radio and communications in general. Education is the principal institution shaping national attitudes and developing modern skills. Moreover, education is probably the most important determinant of social status in urban society, yet it has had relatively little attention, and careful studies of its place and impact on society are almost non-existent.

In economics, our heavy emphasis on South Asia as an area for development, agricultural development in particular, has shaped the distribution of American scholarly interest in the area. Consequently, the three topics that probably represent America's future rather than its past interest in South Asia are relatively underrepresented. They are: (1) the South Asian

particularly Indian, economic role on the international scene--American business is already encountering Indian competition in some of its traditional overseas markets, and the presence of Indian workers in the Gulf, in Canada and in the United States, will make Indians overseas an increasingly important element in international affairs; (2) the development of an important modern industrial establishment; and (3) the potential growth of one of the world's largest and most rapidly developing consumer markets. It is a pity that these three topics are precisely the weak spots in our coverage of South Asian economics--foreign trade, industrial economics and marketing.

As the flood tide of South Asian publications arriving in American libraries increases, accessing and annotating these materials will take on greater and greater importance. Hence, the appearance since 1970 of a substantial set of scholars working on library resources and selective bibliographies is a welcome addition.

Historians, while generally plentiful, seem relatively underrepresented at the two ends of the time continuum. There are few historians (as distinct from textual exegesists and philologists) of the classical period and few scholars working on the history of the post-Independence period. The latter, of course, overlaps with the work of political scientists, but surely modern history should begin to overshadow histories of the British and the Muslim periods as the principal focus of American scholarly interest.

As with economics, political science includes several areas to which national interest would seem to give some urgency but which receive relatively little attention. Among them are studies of the military--not only for strategic reasons but also as a vital force in the societies; elections; political leadership; and, above all, foreign policy.

Studies of religion in South Asia reflect the American concern with traditional Hinduism. Relatively less work has been conducted on modern religious practices or the beliefs and behavior of the influential religious minorities such as the Parsis, Jains and Sikhs, and the neglect of Indian Islam and Indian Christianity is a major shortcoming. One suspects that the same is true of contemporary, as contrasted with historical, Buddhism in South Asia, with the possible exception of Sri Lanka and Nepal.

The number of scholars working in the professional and applied fields is so tiny that their topical distribution is less important. The current numbers represent an encouraging increase over 1970, but many more would be welcome. The role of science and technology transfer in South Asia is of vital interest to the future American business interests and to our relations with South Asia in general, as the debate over nuclear proliferation dramatizes. We continue to view South Asian countries exclusively as backward agricultural societies at our peril.

Because of the special importance of language skills to an understanding of the countries of South Asia, a special tabulation was made of the two relevant groups concerned with languages; one group comprises the linguists and others working on the languages themselves; and the second, those studying literature. Table IV, on page 20, presents the enumeration of the two groups by language, starting with studies of whole language groups or families, then individual modern languages, and finally classical languages. While this fivefold breakdown was not used on the 1970 data, and therefore the data are not exactly parallel, three general trends can be noted. First, studies of national literatures or language families as a whole have given way to studies of particular languages and language-specific literatures. Second, the study of modern languages has

TABLE IV

SCHOLARS ACTIVE BY DISCIPLINE BY LANGUAGE

MULTIPLE LANGUAGES	LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS	LITERATURE
South Asia	2	
India	3	9
INDIVIDUAL LANGUAGES		
Assamese	0	0
Baluchi	1	
Bengali	3	13
Dravidian	7	
English	4	9
Gujarati	1	
Kashmiri/Himalayan	2	
Kannada	3	3
Malayalam	1	2
Marathi	4	5
Munda	3	2
Nepali	5	2
Oriya		2
Punjabi	1	2
Rajasthani	1	
Sinhala	2	1
Sindhi	2	
Tamil	7	13
Telegu	7	2
Tibetan	1	1
Urdu	1	13
Hindi	23	28
Other*	3	
Tribal**	8	
CLASSICAL		
Indo European	12	
Pali	1	2
Sanskrit	30	37

*Car Nicobarese., Kacchi, Proto-Gutab-Remo-Gtaq (1 each)

** Koya, Ho, Khasi, Dari, Lushai, Hayu, Awaditi-Kannauji, Sora (1 each)

expanded both absolutely and relatively to the study of classical languages. Third, the study of individual modern languages has been supplemented by studies of the literatures of those languages.

Within these over-all trends, several features of the distribution of scholars may be noted. Two general impressions emerge. First, there is a remarkable spread of scholars among the various languages; at least one scholar has conducted research on each of the languages of modern South Asia, penetrating even into some of the remote mountain tribal languages. Second, there is an obvious concentration of effort in a few languages: Hindi, Bengali, Tamil and Urdu, the languages most often taught in South Asia language and area centers in the United States. This distribution does not reflect accurately the total number of speakers of those languages nor even the total number of books in those languages in American libraries (see Table V, page 22). Hindi, Urdu and Bengali are national languages of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh respectively and Tamil represents the Dravidian language family of South India. The other national languages on the list, Nepali and Sinhala, are much more poorly represented. Special note should be made of the limited coverage of the languages spoken in the border regions that might come to have special strategic significance. Only Car-Nicobarese is represented among the Indian Ocean languages, Baluchi and Dari--but not Pushto--on the Northwest Frontier and Afghanistan, and two or three tribal languages on the north-east mountain frontier. While the spread that has taken place without any direct intervention has been remarkable, surely some attempt to fill in gaps and increase the amount of scholarship on the important languages aside from the primary four should be mounted.

A special case should be made for the classical languages of South Asia; these languages have a special importance. They are the base for much

TABLE V

SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGE HOLDINGS, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (MAY, 1980)*

language	number	percent
Assamese	825	0.8
Bengali	15,427	14.9
Gujarati	4,760	4.6
Hindi	19,974	19.3
Kannada	4,690	4.5
Malayalam	4,883	4.7
Marathi	6,643	6.4
Nepali	1,725	1.7
Oriya	2,555	2.5
Pali	222	0.2
Punjabi	3,291	3.2
Prakrit	185	0.2
Sanskrit	3,523	3.4
Sindhi	624	0.6
Sinhala	2,125	2.1
Tamil	11,537	11.1
Telugu	5,556	5.4
Urdu	13,266	12.8
Other	1,901	1.8
Total	103,612	100.0

* This list is an approximate count only of the cataloged monographs received under the Books Procurement Program, 1962 to present. It does not count serial collections, classical collections, especially Sanskrit, or the Tibetan collection. Pushto is in the custody of the Near East Section, as is Dari. English language materials are shelved with the General Collections.

of the humanistic studies of the great civilization of India and they are interrelated with the development of our own western civilization. Attempts to reconstruct Proto-Indo-European seek to find the origins of almost all modern Western languages, while Pali and Sanskrit represent further stages in the evolution of our own language base. Moreover, Sanskrit, whose origin and role resemble church Latin, plays an important part in contemporary South Asian society as a language of high culture; in fact, it is one of the fourteen official languages recognized in the constitution. American studies of India's classical languages are a vital part of the South Asian studies and produce many of the materials and interpretations that inform general education courses on South Asia in our secondary school and college curricula.

Geographic Coverage

Just as topical and disciplinary coverage of South Asia has been uneven, so too has been the geographic coverage of the various studies. We will consider them in two aspects. First, the level of generality which the studies purport to cover; and second, the specific country, or, region covered. Table VI (page 24) presents the first of these two aspects, the proportion of studies that cover: (1) either a number of countries within South Asia or one or more of the countries of South Asia as part of a study encompassing a number of the areas of the world; (2) an individual South Asian country at the national level; or (3) a sub-national region, state, city, or village.

As Table VI indicates, most scholars (56.7%) have worked at the national level; only about a third have focussed on sub-national geographic units. Since the states within these countries are as distinctive in their languages and cultures as, say, the major countries of Europe, works at the national or cross-national level tend either to use only secondary sources,

TABLE VI

GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL BY DISCIPLINE (PERCENTAGES), KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS

	Anthro. & Sociology	Archaeology	Arts	Communi-cations	Economics	Education	Geography	History	Library and Biblio.	Political Science	Religion and Philos.	Science and Technology	All Disciplines
Cross-National	11.1	52.1	0.5	4.3	14.1	3.6	4.6	6.5	15.0	16.6	5.1	11.6	10.9
National	52.5	34.0	61.1	78.3	67.3	73.2	72.3	35.1	55.0	61.5	67.5	67.9	56.7
Regional	36.4	13.8	38.4	17.4	18.6	23.2	23.1	58.4	30.0	21.9	27.4	20.5	32.4
N	379	94	203	23	220	56	65	339	40	265	314	78	2076

GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL BY DISCIPLINE (PERCENTAGES), EXPERTS

	Anthropology Sociology	Economics	History	Political Science
Cross-national	4.5	9.3	3.0	7.6
National	31.0	44.2	25.4	57.1
Regional	64.5	46.5	71.6	35.3
N	197	43	134	170

they are confined to materials pertaining to the English-speaking elite, or they use materials available in English. This makes sense for studies of national level politics, foreign policy, science and technology, aggregate analyses of elections or economic development. It makes much less sense for studies in anthropology, sociology, the arts, or history. To some extent, the geographic focus of work in the various disciplines reflects these facts. History leads the other disciplines in geographic specificity with more than half (58.4%) of the scholars working on the subnational level. The arts (38.4%) and anthropology/sociology (36.4%) are above the general average in localized studies. For all the other disciplines, only about a fourth or less of the scholars have dealt with sub-national topics. Most surprising is political science. One might have expected more state and regional political analyses since this is where the interface of politics and society largely takes place and politics and society is the topic within political science in which the largest number of scholars is found. The relatively small proportion at the cross-national level in political science reflects the lack of attention to foreign policy, including relations among the countries of the region itself. As noted earlier, our national interest would surely require a greater attention to this topic. The cross-national focus of archaeology reflects the contemporaneity of current national boundaries.

Shifting from the level of generality to the specific geographic areas covered (Table VII, page 26) it is clear that the overwhelming majority of scholars of South Asia (79.9%) have focused their work on India, either at the national or local level. About five percent have studied Pakistan and Nepal respectively, and lesser proportions have dealt with the other countries of the region. The concentration of scholarly attention on India reflects in part the limitations imposed by some of the governments in the other

TABLE VIIa

GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL

NATIONAL COVERAGE

	NUMBER	PERCENT
India	1447	79.9
Pakistan	90	5.0
Bangladesh	63	3.5
Nepal	93	5.1
Sri Lanka	57	3.1
Afghanistan	55	3.0
Sikkim	4	0.2
Bhutan	2	0.1
TOTAL	1811	100.0%

SUB-NATIONAL INDIA

North India	74	11.9
South India	71	11.4
East India	1	0.2
Central India	14	2.2
West India	26	4.2
Andhra Pradesh	24	3.9
Bihar	20	3.2
Gujarat	21	3.4
Harayanna	3	0.5
Karnataka	5	0.8
Kerala	15	2.4
Maharashtra	24	3.9
Madhya Pradesh	3	0.5
Orissa	15	2.4
Punjab	45	7.2
Rajasthan	24	3.9
Tamil Naudu	76	12.2
Uttar Pradesh	58	9.3
West Bengal	93	14.9
Sub-Total	612	

Sub-National India (Cont'd)

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Goa	3	0.5
Himalayas/Nagaland	4	0.6
Kashmir	3	.0.5
NEFA/NWFA	1	0.2
Sub-Total	11	
TOTAL	623	100.0%

PAKISTAN REGIONAL

Baluchistan	2	18.2
Punjab	6	54.5
Sindh	3	27.3
TOTAL	11	100.0%

TABLE VIIb

KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS - ACTIVE BY DISCIPLINE - BY COUNTRY AND REGION

	Economics	Political Science	History	Sociology & Anthropology	Religion & Philosophy	Art	Others[a]
South Asia	11	16	5	5	2 (1)	3	25
India	89	107(2)	94	121	*190	84	141
Pakistan	16	23	8	22	8	3	14
Bangladesh	21	18	1	13		0	7
Nepal	11	10	5	32	10	6	22
Sri Lanka	9	11	9	7	11	3	5
Afghanistan	4	4	6	8	3	6	8
Sikkim				1	2		1
Bhutan		1		***1	1		
Tibet						2	
International	21	29	17	**37	15	0	5

*A lot of texts as well as other material
**Lots of Indians abroad
***Andaman Islands

North India	6	5	19	17	7(1)	12	7
South India	1	4	14	17	16(3)	16	7
East India	1					2	0
Central India		3	2	4	1	3	0
West India			5	1		2	2
Andhra Pradesh		2	7	7	2(2)	4	3
Assam		2				0	0
Bihar	2	3	6	5	2(2)	0	2
Gujarat	4	1	8	5	1	2	2
Haryana	2	1					
Karnataka	3	2	2	6		1	4
Kerala	1	2	6	5	6(2)	2	2
Maharashtra	1	3	14	13	7(2)	8	3
Madhya Pradesh		1		2			
Orissa		1	2	1	4(2)	5	0
Punjab	6	1	16	7	7(2)	1	5
Rajasthan		3	7	3	1(1)	7	3
Tamil Nadu	5	6	23	19	15(5)	4	7
Uttar Pradesh	2	6	17	10	6	8	10
West Bengal	3	3	42	15	18(8)	3	10
Goa			2				3
Hi- layas/Nagaland			2		2(1)		
Kashmir			1		2	0	3
NEFA/NWTA			1	1			
Sindh		1	2				
Punjab (P)	5	2	6	4			
Baluchistan			1	1			

[a]Education, Communications & Media, Libraries and Bibliography
Science & Technology
Geography

countries of the region on American research scholars; in part it reflects the countries' relative size and importance on the international scene; and in part it reflects the fact that India is the center of a world civilization whereas the other countries of the area are viewed as marginal to other great civilizations--Islamic in the case of Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan; Buddhist in the case of Sri Lanka, and Tibetan in the case of the Himalayan regions. Whatever the reason, however, the consequence is a rather light coverage of the countries other than India. This light coverage shows up not only in the low numbers of scholars working in these countries, but the overwhelming preponderance of studies at the national level as against the sub-national level. It is true that there is somewhat less regional variability in most of these countries, and that in the case of Pakistan, the government there tends to discourage American scholars from working in the western and northern mountain sections of the country. But beyond that, the lack of regionalization of research in Pakistan--and there are linguistic-cultural divides among the regions similar to those in India--indicates an earlier stage of development of research on countries in South Asia other than India.

Within India itself two facts are evident. First, there is a surprising spread of scholars among the various regions, surprising because there has been no deliberate attempt to ensure regional dispersion of research. Second, there is an uneven coverage of the various regions within India. Among studies at the regional level, that is, research whose focus is on a number of but not all states, studies of North India predominate although South India is now surprisingly close. A decade ago, these figures would certainly not have been as close. The other regions--east, central and west--are much less commonly used as research rubrics.

At the state level, the major concentration of scholars studying Bengal, followed by Tamil Nadu, is impressive. These two states include the major cities of Calcutta and Madras. The somewhat lower amount of attention given to Maharashtra and Bombay, the latter a major center of modernization in South Asia, is notable. Aside from the states that hold the metropolitan areas, the relative coverage of the other states reflects their varying importance to national life. However, using the latter criterion, one might have expected the number of scholars studying Kerala and Karnataka to have at least equalled the number studying Bihar. This regional concentration of American research effort represents historic regional preferences of the major American South Asia studies centers and is reflected and perpetuated by the languages offered and the specialities of the various faculty members. Special efforts will have to be made if the remaining pockets of relative neglect are to be filled.

From the perspective of our national interest, it is useful to note once again that few American scholars have been working in any of the strategic areas of the sub-continent. Indeed, we found almost no one working on Assam or Himachal Pradesh, only linguists in the Indian Ocean areas, and a very few scholars in Kashmir or the tribal areas on the China and Burma borders. As in the case of Pakistan, many of these areas are not open to American academic researchers, but a more likely reason is that they are marginal to the great Indian civilization that has fascinated so many American scholars, and hence are neglected.

Experts

So far we have been discussing all American producers of scholarly knowledge about South Asia. Because of the ready access of materials in English and the ease of contact by Americans with English-speaking elites, it is still possible to conduct important scholarly research in South Asia using only English. For this reason, South Asian societies open themselves to the interests of one-time researchers who can and do make original contributions using English language primary materials. Such opportunities are not equally available to those studying, say, Japan or the Soviet Union. It would be unfortunate if the richness of this flow of scholarly work by non-specialists were to be curtailed. It provides a constant, refreshing stream of new insights and interpretations into South Asian studies. However, as we have argued at the outset, in the case of the mission-oriented occupations, the national interest requires the creation and maintenance of a cadre of genuine specialists who spend a substantial portion of their professional lives concerned with the societies of South Asia, specialists who are familiar enough with one or more of its languages to be able to reach beyond the limits of the English materials and English speaking elites. It is they who can deal directly with the eighty to ninety percent of the population that does not speak English. Accordingly, we are especially interested in that sub-set of individuals contributing knowledge about South Asia who have a genuine competency in the area and command one or more of its languages.

Defining such competencies is not an easy task. In the 1970 Language and Area Studies Review, we used a combination of field experience and self-rated language skills to identify "residence and language qualified specialists". We included in that term all those who reported: (1) that they

had made at least two visits to the area—one within the past five years—for a total of residence of at least three years; and (2) that they could speak, read or write one of the languages of South Asia "easily." Even this seems like a minimal set of qualifications for a genuine language and area expertise. Moreover, self-rated language skills are notoriously prone to exaggeration. Even allowing for these biases, however, only 87 South Asian specialists, out of a total number of 1059 in the 1970[4] study met these qualifications. Unfortunately, we do not have similar questionnaire data on which to base an enumeration today. What we have instead is a judgment made by peers in the discipline, judgments as to who is and is not a genuinely competent specialist.

Our procedure was as follows: First, we assembled the detailed lists by discipline of producers of scholarly knowledge about South Asia--the ones that have been the basis of analysis up to this point--those who published an article or book, delivered a paper at an area focussed professional meeting, or held a fellowship for field research in the region, or finished a doctoral dissertation on the area. Each disciplinary list was then sent to four or five senior specialists in that field. The complete list was sent to members of the South Asia Regional Council of the Association of Asian Studies, to several knowledgeable government officials and, of course, the committee members added their own judgment. Each judge was asked: (1) to prune the list of non-U.S. resident scholars; (2) to indicate those who are still active in the field whose primary discipline—not the one listed as the topic of a particular work—is the one indicated and whose professional work is largely concerned with South Asia; and (3) to check those who had a genuine competency in one or more of the languages of the area. This we took to be the peer group judgmental equivalent of the earlier behavioral and self-rated

definition of competency. While the methods of definition of competency are quite different, they both do try to identify a sub-set of people who might be called language and area experts on South Asia.

Column two of Table VIII (page 34) presents the number judged to be experts by their peers, and column three the subset of those who are judged to have a language competency as well. The total number of area experts according to peer group judgment is 762, and 544 of those are believed to have a language competency as well; that is, 37.2% of the total number of knowledge contributors were judged to be area experts, and 71.4% of those or 26.6% of all contributors had a language as well as an area competency. It is with this cadre of genuine experts that policy directed to the national interest should be concerned. It is they who, over the long haul, will provide the sophisticated knowledge in depth about South Asia that our society needs, using indigenous languages to study at first hand the literatures, cultures and societies of South Asia. Whatever limitations on comparability inhibit direct comparison between the 87 "residence and language qualified" specialists in the 1970 inventory and the 544 professional area experts with language competency enumerated in this study, surely considerable progress has been made in creating a pool of genuinely competent South Asia experts in the United States.

It is interesting to note that whatever "hidden hand" has allocated general scholarly interest in South Asia among the various disciplines, it has roughly matched that distribution among the experts. There are very few experts who concentrate on the applied and scientific field and even fewer with language competencies. The resistance of economists to learning a language and the tendency of those in religion and philosophy to do so mirrors the general preference in those disciplines. Political scientists are more

TABLE VIII

AREA EXPERTS BY DISCIPLINE AND LANGUAGE COMPETENCY

discipline	knowledge producers number	knowledge producers percent	expert pool number	expert pool percent	language competent experts number	language competent experts percent
Anthropology & Sociology	363	17.7	112	14.7	101	18.6
Archaeology	46	2.2	16	2.1	13	2.4
Art & Art History	137	6.7	73	9.6	46	8.5
Economics	113	5.5	36	4.7	13	2.4
Geography	107	5.2	49	6.4	31	5.7
History	268	13.1	81	10.6	70	12.9
Indology	114	5.6	53	7.0	53	9.7
Language & Linguistics	118	5.8	50	6.6	48	8.8
Literature	122	6.0	40	5.2	33	6.1
Performing Arts	79	3.9	22	2.9	8	1.5
Political Science	242	11.8	103	13.5	39	7.2
Religion & Philosophy	155	7.6	96	12.6	71	13.1
Communications	18	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Education	54	2.6	3	0.4	0	0.0
Library & Bibliography	38	1.9	25	3.3	16	2.9
Science & Technology	72	3.5	3	0.4	2	0.4
Total	2046	100.0	762	100.0	544	100.0

37.2% of the total pool were judged to be area experts
26.6% of the total pool were judged to be language competent experts
71.4% of the area experts were judged to be language competent.

N.B. The percentages in the table are calculated vertically within each column. For example, 17.7% of all knowledge producers are anthropologists or sociologists; 14.7% of all experts and 18.6% of all experts who were reported to have a language competency.

common among experts than the general run of knowledge producers but relatively low among those with language competency. Overall, however, the disciplinary distributions among all knowledge producers on the expert subset are remarkably similar.

The same is true of the topical fields within the disciplines. Using the sub-disciplinary fields in three of the core disciplines, anthropology/sociology, history and political science, and adding economics, Table IX (page 36) indicates how close the topical concentrations among the experts match the concentration of effort among the general set of knowledge producers. Anthropology/sociology does present some contrasts between general producers and experts: the latter contain fewer demographers and more scholars studying the family and kinship. However, even here the overall distributions are remarkably similar.

The same match between experts and knowledge producers that we found among the disciplines occurs in the choice of country on which specialists conduct their research: 80.6% of the general knowledge producers conduct their research on India as compared with 84.0% of the experts; 6.6% of the knowledge producers concentrate on Pakistan as compared with 7.1% of the experts; and the proportions concentrating on the other countries are equally small. Even the intra-national regional distributions of knowledge producers or experts are similar.

Where the experts do differ is in the geographic specificity of their work. It is the experts who are conducting the fundamental research at the sub-national level. For instance, about two-thirds of the experts who are anthropologists or sociologists are working at a sub-national level compared with only 36.4% of all knowledge producers; 46.5% of the economist experts

TABLE IXa

PERCENT COMPARISON OF TOPICAL COVERAGE WITHIN DISCIPLINES BY GENERAL KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS AND EXPERTS

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

	knowledge producers	area experts
General	9.0	12.1
Demography	14.4	7.1
Rural Society	9.6	9.6
Urbanization	11.3	14.1
Sociology of Work	5.4	4.5
Social Psychology	3.0	3.0
Social Conflict	3.9	1.5
Family & Kinship	16.4	22.7
Caste, Community	25.7	25.3
Physical Anthropology	1.2	0.0

experts: 35.4% national or cross-national coverage
producers: 56.5% national or cross-national coverage

ECONOMICS

	knowledge producers	area experts
General	5.9	9.3
Agricultural & Rural	45.0	46.5
International	10.7	7.0
Commerce, Industry, Labor	10.7	7.0
Economic Development	16.3	18.6
Planning, Policy	7.3	7.0
Markets, Supply	4.2	4.7

experts: 53.5% national or cross-national coverage
producers: 73.7% national or cross-national coverage

TABLE IXa (con't): Comparison of topical coverage within disciplines by general knowledge producers and experts

HISTORY

	knowledge producers	area experts
General	8.5	7.1
Biography	10.9	7.8
Before 1000 A.D.	3.4	2.1
1000 - 1764	12.5	12.1
1765 - 1857	17.9	20.6
1858 1947	40.0	42.6
194[illegible] present	6.8	7.8

experts: 27.0% national or cross-national coverage
producers: 39.8% national or cross-national coverage

POLITICAL SCIENCE

	knowledge producers	area experts
General	6.8	7.6
Individual political figures	4.1	4.7
Political parties	10.7	12.3
Electoral behavior	4.3	5.9
Political behavior & society	21.5	22.4
Foreign policy	10.4	8.8
Military affairs	2.8	2.4
Political allocation of resources	9.4	11.8
Administration, Organizations, Institutions	11.1	8.2
Levels of the Political System	12.4	14.7
Law	6.4	1.2

experts: 64.7% national or cross-national coverage
producers: 68.2% national or cross-national coverage

TABLE IXb

GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISON OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS AND EXPERTS FOR ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY, ECONOMICS, HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

geographic unit	knowledge producers number	knowledge producers percent	area experts number	area experts percent
India	1401	80.6	426	84.0
Pakistan	115	6.6	36	7.1
Bangladesh	60	3.5	6	1.2
Nepal	75	4.3	19	3.7
Sri Lanka	50	2.9	12	2.4
Afghanistan	31	1.8	8	1.6
Sikkim	2	0.1	—	—
Bhutan	3	0.2	—	—
Tibet	1	0.1	—	—
Total	1738	100.0	507	100.0
North India	88	11.6	41	14.5
South India	84	11.1	28	9.9
East India	1	0.1	—	—
Central India	5	0.7	1	0.4
West India	11	1.4	2	0.7
Andhra Pradesh	33	4.3	19	6.7
Bihar	28	3.7	6	2.1
Gujarat	34	4.5	8	2.8
Haryana	2	0.3	1	0.4
Karnataka	19	2.5	11	3.9
Kerala	22	2.9	5	1.8
Maharashtra	58	7.6	20	7.1
Madhya Pradesh	2	0.3	1	0.4
Orissa	16	2.1	3	1.1
Punjab	42	5.5	18	6.4
Rajasthan	19	2.5	13	4.6
Tamil Nadu	98	12.9	33	11.7
Uttar Pradesh	67	8.8	23	8.1
West Bengal	120	15.8	47	16.6

Table IXb (con't): Geographic comparison of knowledge producers and experts for anthropoloty and sociology, economics, history, and political science

geographic unit	knowledge producers number	knowledge producers percent	area experts number	area experts percent
Goa	2	0.3	--	--
Himalayas/Nagaland	6	0.8	--	--
Kashmir	2	0.3	--	--
NEFA/NWFA	1	0.1	3	1.1
Total	760	100.0	283	100.0
Baluchistan	5	15.2	1	9.1
Punjab (P)	21	63.6	9	81.8
Sind	7	21.2	1	9.1
Total	33	100.0	11	100.0

compared with 18.6% of the producers; 71.6% of the historian experts compared with 58.4% of the general producers; and 35.3% of the expert political scientists compared with only 21.9% of the producers in general. The low proportion of regionally-focussed experts in political science as compared with the other core disciplines is a little surprising.

National Needs

Having reviewed the existing pool of knowledge producers and experts, it remains to specify the complement of scholars which the national need will require. In the following discussion, we will assume that all of the experts we are discussing are area and language competent, unlike our variegated FSI graded specifications for different mission-oriented occupations. We do so not because we believe that non-specialists have no role in producing useful knowledge about South Asia, but because it is the cadre of experts with which we are presently concerned. Except for this demand for full competency for each of the projections of national need by specialty, we will follow somewhat the same procedures as we did in discussing the mission-oriented occupations at the outset. We will try to keep in mind the existing institutional structure into which the academic specialists must fit, but we urge an upgrading of language and area competent cadres in those institutions and organizations that might in the near future reasonably be expected to be able to use these skills. In doing so, we are deliberately projecting a little beyond existing demand, but not so much so that the goal is unreasonable. Indeed, in many cases, an upgrading of the skill level of a larger proportion of the existing stock of knowledge producers into fully competent experts would accomplish the purpose. This can be done by training the current group

of knowledge producers--thus not adding to but upgrading the total stock; or by adding highly trained new recruits to replace the less competent. The latter has been the strategy since the beginning of NDEA VI. Upgrading of the existing stock may become equally important.

With these caveats in mind, we stipulate national targets for a cadre of experts on South Asia using the following simple criteria. First, we envisage a three tiered institutional structure in which there are large national centers with a fairly full complement of specialists in many disciplines and languages, a set of smaller but still organized centers with a minimal critical mass of specialists, and finally individuals or small clusters scattered through many institutions. We estimate the first group at about ten, some four more than existing NDEA centers to allow for growth. We take the total number of programs to be about 35, the current membership of the American Institute of Indian Studies which includes almost all of the institutions with an organized interest in South Asia. The final tier comprises what are usually called the isolate scholars. Our data show individual experts scattered through at least a hundred other institutions.

This institutional structure will be crossed with the centrality of various disciplines and languages to South Asian studies, calling for a larger number and more dispersed pattern for the central disciplines and languages and locating the truly scarce skills and languages in only a few of the largest, most comprehensive centers.

We believe that all programs should have the ability to give instruction at least in beginning Hindi/Urdu and to provide a combination of advanced training and literary studies in at least one of these languages, probably Hindi, the official language of India. The largest ten programs should have two language/linguists working in Hindi/Urdu, one at the early

and the other at the advanced level and a literature specialist in each. Tamil and Bengali should also be available at all of the ten large centers, taught both by a linguist and a literature specialist. Sinhala, Nepali, Gujarati, Marathi, Kannada, Telegu and Malayalam should be taught in at least two of ten centers by one linguist and one literature specialist, and Punjabi, Assamese, Oriya, Bihari, Pushto, Dari and the scattered tribal languages divided among the centers. Not all of these language specialists would, of course, be located at centers so we have added ten Hindi specialists and one each to the next tier of languages to allow for that. This would provide a coverage of the various languages as indicated in Table X (page 43). The first column gives the existing stock of linguists; the second,the literature specialists, and the third,the list of needed specialists according to the above specification.

A similar procedure has been followed with the various disciplines, except that those which serve as an important component of the general education sigment of college instruction are assumed to have a substantial distribution outside of the centers. Paramount among these are anthropology/sociology, history, and political science, and in the case of India, religion and philosophy. For each of these we specify a minimal group of 150 specialists. We see the arts and literature--both modern and classical (or Indology as it is sometimes called)--having a similar general educational purpose but not quite as widely distributed. The remaining disciplines we have specified either as primarily restricted to the large centers as with communication or education or more dispersed as geography and economics. Table XI (page 44) compares these ideal figures with the existing stock of experts. While we would not want to

TABLE X

AREA EXPERTS IN MODERN LANGUAGES

	Language & Linguistics	Literature	Total	Optimum
Bengali	1	5	6	25
Hindi	10	5	15	90
Tamil	2	5	7	25
Urdu	3	2	5	25
Gujarati	1	0	1	5
Kannada	2	1	3	5
Malayalam	0	0	0	5
Marathi	2	1	3	5
Nepali	0	2	2	5
Sinhala	1	0	1	5
Telegu	1	2	3	5
Tribal	4	0	4	5
Assamese	0	0	0	2
Bihari	0	0	0	2
Farsi	0	0	0	2
Oriya	1	0	1	2
Pushto	0	0	0	2
	28	23	51	215

TABLE XI

AREA EXPERTS BY DISCIPLINE: OPTIMUMS AND EXISTING POOL

Discipline	Existing Experts	Existing Language Competent	Optimum
Anthropology and Sociology	112	101	160
Archaeology	16	13	15
Art and Art History	73	46	50
Economics	36	13	35
Geography	49	31	40
History	81	70	150
Indology	53	50	72
Language and Linguistics	50	48	204
Literature	40	33	63
Performing Arts	22	8	75
Political Science	103	39	150
Religion and Philosophy	96	71	155
Communications	0	0	10
Education	3	0	10
Library and Bibliography	25	16	30
Science and Technology	3	2	10
Total	762	541	1229

be over specific in an exercise that is at every step based on very rough approximations, these figures produce an estimate of the need for 164 more experts in the languages and literatures of South Asia, and 688 language competent area experts. Some of the latter may be added to the stock by upgrading the skills of some of the existing specialists as well as by adding new trainees to the field.

Estimates of numerical needs either to remain at the same number of qualified specialists or to reach the optimal level must also allow for attrition in the existing stock. There are two ways of looking at attrition, one focuses on the loss in the number of people who remain concerned with South Asia, and the second is concerned with the diminution in skills of those who remain in the field. The two are, of course, interrelated but not coterminous.

For the former, it is possible to make a few rough numerical estimates. We can derive from the age structure of the existing pool of specialists the percent who will retire over the next ten years. Barber and Ilchman[5] estimate this to be 36.6% for South and Southeast Asia combined, and there is no reason to believe that the two groups of specialists would differ in this respect. Hence, just to stay in the same place we would need to assure that at least 19 language and literature experts and 209 language competent area experts are added to the stock. Accordingly, using just the retirement replacement ratios and the gaps between existing and optimal stocks of language-competent experts, we estimate a need of 1080 more experts, of whom 183 should be in language and literature. Spread over a ten year period, the period used by Barber and Ilchman in estimating retirement replacements, this comes to 108 South Asia language and area specialist Ph.d's per year.

There is, however, another aspect of attrition that must be added to the reckoning. As yet, we know almost nothing about what proportion of trainees stay in the field at varying intervals after they are trained. It is hoped that the forthcoming Rand Corporation study will shed some light on this question. In the meantime, in an attempt to get a rough estimate, we asked the Directors of the two largest South Asia Studies programs, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Chicago, to go through their lists of American students receiving South Asia focused graduate degrees at their institutions over the past two decades and to indicate what proportion were still active in the field of South Asia Studies. Averaging the data from the two programs, roughly 75% of those receiving Ph.D.'s are still in the field. The highly specialized and extensive training given to students in these two large programs probably means that the attrition rate among their graduates is lower than among those trained elsewhere, and if one counted terminal M.A.'s as well as Ph.D.'s, the attrition would be considerably higher; therefore, using twenty-five percent as an estimate of the attrition rate of trainees is probably a conservative measure. Adding twenty-five percent to the earlier estimate of 1080 new language competent specialists needed to reach optimal levels brings the total to 1350, or about 135 per year over a ten year period.

The second way of viewing attrition is in the diminished skill level of those who remain in the field. It is common knowledge that language skills among South Asia specialists quickly atrophy with disuse, but we do not know how many of the 544 experts who, by reputation, were language proficient at some time in the past would survive a rigorous language examination at the current time. The field is just not organized to address this question, nor

to assist specialists who desire to reinforce or restore their competencies. Almost all of our effort is directed at providing a language skill to students at the beginning of their careers. We have no mechanism, except periodic field visits, to reinforce or restore skills once lost, and we have no idea about the frequency and purpose of those visits which would maximally maintain competencies. Surely, the academic sabbatical rhythm of seventh-yearly trips does not lend itself to the necessary timely reinforcement. And what is true of language skills is also true of research skills more generally. We have not addressed the question of what is necessary to maintain a research competency on South Asia. For one thing, overseas fellowship opportunities have to be carefully monitored. Barber and Ilchman[6] found that using their medium estimate of the current supply and demand for postdoctoral research awards for South and Southeast Asian studies, the demand for research opportunities was already twice as high as the supply, and the gap is almost certain to increase in the near future.

There is, however, an even more fundamental problem which is already beginning to appear. We referred earlier to the effect of the hidden hand in encouraging the growth of the existing corps of specialists and distributing them throughout the regions and topical specialities. A major feature of that hidden hand has been steady expansion of the market demand for all kinds of teachers in our universities and colleges, making it possible for educational demand to match research needs. In the current parlous state of the job market for college teachers, it can no longer be assumed that national needs for a knowledge-producing cadre of specialists will automatically be met by the teaching job market. Unless some means is devised to sustain our

research capacity, particularly in some of the scarcer specialties, the attrition rate among the existing stock of specialists, both in diminution of their expertise and their loss to the field is likely to be considerably higher than the attrition rates used in the above calculations.

Aside from the deficiencies in total numbers that these figures give rise to are the questions of topical balance and lack of coverage among geographic areas which appeared throughout the report. We urge as a high priority for the field early attention to these questions of distribution. In the case of intra-disciplinary research foci, better balance may be obtained just by calling attention to the gaps. Larger shifts in topics, and especially shifts to neglected countries and areas may call for earmarked research funding or even special training fellowships. We would like to make a special plea for expanding the cadre of experts and the enhancement of the language and area skills of the existing group of knowledge producers in the applied disciplines. Such disciplines provide both the training grounds and the most immediately relevant information for the mission-oriented occupations.

APPENDIX A

SUBDISCIPLINARY DISTRIBUTION OF WORK

ANTHROPOLOGY-SOCIOLOGY	NUMBER	PERCENT
General	50	8.5
Demography	83	14.0
Rural	58	9.8
Urban	65	11.0
Work	31	5.2
Social Psychology	17	2.9
Social Conflict	23	3.9
Family and kinship	101	17.1
Caste, Communities	156	26.4
Physical	7	1.2
	591	100.0
ARTS		
General	35	12.7
Architecture	42	15.2
Cinemar	5	1.8
Dance	8	2.9
Folk Art	16	5.8
Music	57	20.7
Painting	27	9.8
Archaeology	46	16.7
Sculpture	23	8.3
Theater	17	6.2
	276	100.0

Appendix A: Subdisciplinary distribution of work

COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA	NUMBER	PERCENT
General	1	3.7
Press	16	59.3
Films and Radio	6	22.2
Communication	4	14.8
	27	100.0
ECONOMICS		
General	18	6.8
Agricultural/rural	123	46.6
International	30	11.4
Industrial	12	4.5
Economic Development	46	17.4
Planning,Policy	23	8.7
Markets	12	4.5
	264	100.0
EDUCATION		
General	4	7.0
Planning, Policy	18	31.6
Empirical, Behavioral	8	14.0
Descriptive	27	47.4
	57	100.0
GEOGRAPHY		
General	3	4.5
Urban	12	18.2
Rural	8	12.2
Cultural	10	15.2
Human	8	12.2
Descriptive/Travel	25	37.9
	66	100.0

Appendix A: Subdisciplinary distribution of work

HISTORY	NUMBER	PERCENT
General	44	9.4
Biography	55	11.8
Up to 1000	17	3.6
1000 to 1764	43	9.2
1765 to 1857	88	18.9
1858 to 1947	191	41.0
1948 +	28	6.0
	466	100.0
LANGUAGE & LINGUISTICS		
General	10	5.4
Comparative	26	14.1
Descriptive	14	7.6
Historical	29	15.7
Social	18	9.7
Phonetics	19	10.3
Morphology	19	10.3
Syntax	46	24.9
Learning	4	2.2
	185	100.0
LIBRARIES & BIBLIOGRAPHIES		
Archives, Libraries	11	22.9
Sources, Bibliographies	37	77.1
	48	100.0

Appendix A: Subdisciplinary distribution of work

LITERATURE	NUMBER	PERCENT
General	1	0.5
Criticism	66	35.9
Fiction	35	19.0
Folklore	18	9.8
Poetry	36	19.6
Translations	15	8.2
Drama	13	7.1
	184	100.0
POLITICAL SCIENCE		
General	36	7.0
Political Figures	21	4.1
Political parties	57	11.0
Electoral Behavior	19	3.7
Political Behavior and Society	115	22.3
Foreign Policy	54	10.5
Military	15	2.9
Resource Allocation	49	9.5
Administration, organization	51	9.9
Levels of the Political System	67	13.0
Law	32	6.2
	516	100.0

Appendix A: Subdisciplinary distribution of work

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY	NUMBER	PERCENT
General	44	13.8
Hinduism	66	20.6
Buddhism	42	13.1
Islam	23	7.2
Zoroastrianism	5	1.6
Jainism	6	1.9
Sikhism	5	1.6
Christianity	30	9.4
Temples and Shrines	17	5.3
Sects and Movements	41	12.8
Texts	41	12.8
	320	100.0

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		
General	3	3.4
Environment	8	9.1
Geology	1	1.1
Medicine	22	25.0
Nutrition	3	3.4
Public Health	17	19.3
Psychology	26	29.5
Animal Husbandry and Agriculture	8	9.1
	88	100.0

APPENDIX B

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK IN SOUTH ASIA BY SUBDISCIPLINE AND BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Anthropology and Sociology

Anthropology and Sociology, Work by Experts

Arts

Economics,

Economics, Work by Experts

Geography

History

History, Work by Experts

Indology

Language and Linguistics

Literature

Political Science

Political Science, Work by Experts

Religion and Philosophy

Communications

Education

Libraries and Bibliographies

Science and Technology

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate work done by historians

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

	General	Demography	Rural Sociology	Urbanization	Sociology of Work	Social Psych.	Social Conflict	Family & Kinship	Communities Caste	Physical Anthropology
South Asia	3	3(1)		1						4
India	18(3)	36(2)	15-	17(3)	11(1)	9	8(4)	29(3)	31(9)	
Pakistan	2	7		3(1)	2		1	5	2	
Bangladesh		10	1					1		
Nepal	2	7	7	3		1	1	10	15	
Sri Lanka		3(1)	1					1	3(1)	
Afghanistan	3	1	3					1	2	
Sikkim	1	1								
Andaman Islands		1								
Incernational	3(1)	8	1	1	5			9	21(3)	
Central India	1							1		
North India	2(1)	1(1)	3(1)	5(2)		1	3(1)	9	9(2)	1
South India	2(1)		5(1)	1	3(1)		1(1)	5(1)	11(1)	1
West India									2(1)	
Andhra Pradesh	2		3	3(1)	1			2	1	
Bihar	1(1)		2(1)		2(1)		1(1)		5(1)	
Gujarat			1	3(1)	2(1)		2	2	2(1)	
Karnataka			2	2				2	3(2)	
Maharashtra	2(1)	4		5(2)	2(1)		2(1)	1	9(2)	
Orissa				1				1	1	
Punjab			1		1		2(2)	1	3(1)	1
Rajasthan	2(1)		1					1	1(1)	
Tamil Nadu	4	1	4(2)	7(2)	1	3		3	10(3)	
Uttar Pradesh		1	1	8(2)		1		2	9(5)	
Kashmir									1(1)	
NWFA	1									
Baluchistan								1	1	
Punjab(P)			2	1		1				
Sind		1(1)								
W. Bengal	3(2)		4(2)	6(1)	2	2	1(1)	9(3)	9(4)	
Kerala	1						1(1)	1	1(1)	

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK BY AREA EXPERTS

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

	General	Demography	Rural Sociology	Urbanization	Sociology of Work	Social Psychology	Social Conflict	Family & Kinship	Caste	Physical Anthropology
South Asia	2									
India	8	4(1)	1(1)	3	1	3	1(1)	4(1)	6(2)	
Pakistan	2	2		1				3		
Bangladash			1							
Nepal	3	1	3	1				5	3	
Sri Lanka		1	1					1	1	
Afghanistan									1	
Sikkim										
Inrernational								1	6(3)	
Central India								1		
North India		1(1)	1	2				7	3(2)	
South India	1(1)		1		1			3(1)	4	
West India										
Andhra Pradesh	1		3	2(1)	1			1	1(1)	
Bihar	1(1)									
Gujarat			1(1)							
Karnataka			1	3				2	1	
Kerala	1						1(1)	1	1(1)	
Maharasthra	1	1		2(1)	1			1	5	
Orissa				1				1	1	
Punjab			1				1(1)		1	
Rajasthan	1		1					1	2(1)	
Tamil Nadu	2(1)	1	2(1)	4(2)				2	4	
Uttar Pradesh		1		4	1	1		3(1)	1	
West Bengal	1(1)		2	3	2	2		5	6(1)	
Kashmir										
NWFA										
Baluchistan								1	1	
Punjab(P)										
Sind					1					
Unspecified		2		2(2)	1			2	2(1)	

	GENERAL 3.0	ARCHI. 3.1	CINEMA 3.2	DANCE 3.3	FOLK ARTS POTTERY TEXTILES 3.4	MUSIC 3.5	PAINTING 3.6	ARCHEO. 3.7	SCULP. 3.9	THEATRE 3.j
SOUTH ASIA	1							1	1	
INDIA	14	12	3	4	4	22	16	14(5)	9	10
PAKISTAN					2			5(1)	2	
BANGLADESH									1	
NEPAL	2	2			1	1	1	1	2	
SRI LANKA		1		1	1			1		
AFGHANISTAN	1	2			2	1		6(1)	1	1
TIBET						2				
INTERNATIONAL								3		
CENTRAL INDIA					1	2		1		
NORTH INDIA	2	2				8	2	2		1
SOUTH INDIA	1	4				8	1	3	2	
WEST INDIA	1	1				2		2	1	
ANDH. PRADESH					1	1				1
ASSAM								3		
BENGAL	1								2	1
EAST INDIA										
GUJARAT				1						
KARANTAKA						3				
KASHMIR					1					
KERALA						1				1
MADHYA PRADESH								2		
MAHARASHTRA		1				2		2	1	2
ORISSA	2	3		1					1	
PUNJAB							1			
RAJASTHAN	2(1)					1	4			
UTTAR PRADESH				1	1	2	2		3	
TAMIL NADU			2		1	1		1		
SIND								1		
NWFA								3		
PUNJAB(P)	1							1		

(parentheses = Numismatics)

ECONOMICS

	GENERAL 6.0	AGRI.& RURAL 6.1	INTERNATIONAL 6.2	COMMERCE IND.LABOR 6.3	EC.DULP 6.4	PLANNING POLICY 6.5	SUPPLY MARKETS 6.6
SOUTH ASIA	2	4	1		4	1	
INDIA	6(3)	42 (3)	13	21 (3)	16 (4)	11 (1)	8 (1)
PAKISTAN	1	7	3	3	2	1	
BANGLADESH		13	1	1	6	3	
NEPAL	1	6	1		3		
SRI LANKA	1	5			1	1	
AFGHANISTAN		1	1				2
INTERNATIONAL	2	4	7	2	4	1	
BENGAL		4 (3)	1 (1)		3 (1)		
BIHAR	1(1)	2 (1)		1			
CENTRAL INDIA		1 (1)					
EAST INDIA		1					
GUJARAT		3	1 (1)	1 (1)	1		
HARYANA		1					
KARNATAKA		3					
KERALA			1 (1)	1	1		
MAHARASHTRA		3 (3)			1 (1)		
NORTH INDIA	1(1)	7 (2)	1 (1)		1	1	1 (1)
PUNJAB	1	3 (2)			1		1
SOUTH INDIA	1(1)	1 (1)		1(1)			
TAMIL NADU		8 (4)			1	2	
UTTAR PRADESH		3 (1)			2(1)		
PUNJAB (P)		5					

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK BY AREA EXPERTS

ECONOMICS

	GENERAL	AGRIC & RURAL	INTERNATIONAL	INDUSTRY COMMERCE LABOR	ECON DVLP	PLANNING POLICY	SUPPLY MARKETS
SOUTH ASIA	2	1					
INDIA	1	3(1)	3	2	4	1	1
PAKISTAN	1				1	2	
BANGLADESH		1					
NEPAL					1		
SRI LANKA							
INTERNATIONAL		1					
NORTH INDIA		2(2)					1
SOUTH INDIA		1(1)					
BIHAR		2					
HARYANA		1					
MAHARASHTRA		2(2)					
PUNJAB		1(1)					
TAMIL NADU		2(2)					
WEST BENGAL		1(1)			3(1)		
PUNJAB (P)		2		1			

	GENERAL 8.0	URBAN 8.1	RURAL REGIONAL 8.2	CULTURAL 8.3	HUMAN 8.4	DESCRIPTION & TRAVEL 8.5
SOUTH ASIA				2		1
INDIA	2	6 (2)	3	5 (1)	4	5 (1)
PAKISTAN		2	1		1	1
BANGLADESH		1	1			
NEPAL		2		1		6
SRI LANKA						2
AFGHANISTAN	1					2
SIKKIM						1
ANDHRA PRADESH		1				
KASHMIR						1
LADAKH						1
MAHARASHTRA						1
NORTH INDIA					2	
SOUTH INDIA				1	1	
TAMIL NADU			2 (1)			
UTTAR PRADESH				1		2
WEST BENGAL						1
WESTERN INDIA			1			1 (1)
SIND		1				
PUNJAB(P)			1(1)			

Hill Station
Elite Residential Colony
Social Ecology of 3 urban centers
Traffic Patterns
Physical Structure of Islamic Cities

Spatial Controls on Political alignments
Land Capability Analysis
Cultural Geography of Water Buffalo
Study of Rural Service Centers, spatial factors of develop.
Agrarian System Dynamics
District as Ethnic Unit

Information Flow
Places of Pilgrimage
Recreational Geography

Social & Occupational Structures of Cities
Spatial Aspects Diffusion Family Planning
Literacy in Rural India
Spatial Patterns of Fertility — Spatial Range of Marriages
Causes of Migration — Refugee Resettlement

of Debatable Value

HISTORY

	General	Biography	Up to 1000	1000-1764	1765-1857	1858-1947	1948 forward
South Asia	2	1	2			2	1
India	14	18	7	12	21	56	7
Pakistan	2	1				1	2
Sri Lanka	3*	2		2	2	4	1
Nepal	3	1**			1	2	
Afghanistan	1	1			3	3	
International	2	3			4	10	1
North India	2	2	1	5	5	7	2
South India	1		4	3	7	13	1
Central India		1				1	
West India	2			1	1	3	
Andhra Pradesh	1		1	1	4	3	1
Bihar				1	3	5	
Gujarat		1	1	2	2	5	
Kerala		1		2	2	5	
Karnataka					1	1	
Maharashtra		4			1	9	4
Orissa	1						
Punjab	1	3		1	4	11	1
Rajasthan		2		2	1	2	
Tamil Nadu	4	4	1	4	6	13	2
Uttar Pradesh		1			5	14	1
West Bengal	3	10		6	13	22	2
Goa	2						
Himalaya Nagaland NEFA/NWFA						4	2
Kashmir	1						
Baluchistan						2	
Punjab(P)	1			1	2	2	2
Sind				1	1		1

*subnational district level

**Tibet Dalai Lama

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK BY AREA EXPERTS

HISTORY

	General	Biography	Up to 1000	1000-1764	1765-1857	1858-1947	1948 forward
South Asia			1				
India	2	1		1	5	14	4
Pakistan		1					
Sri Lanka	1			1		1	
Nepal							
Afghanistan					1	2	
International						3	
North India	1			3	4	6	2
South India	2	1	2	2	2	3	
Central India							
West India				1			
Andhra Pradesh	1			2	2	1	
Bihar						1	
Gujarat		1			1	1	1
Kerala					1	1	
Karnataka							
Maharashtra		2			2	1	
Orissa							
Punjab	1	1			2	4	1
Rajasthan				1		1	
Tamil Nadu	1			1	4	5	1
Uttar Pradesh		1			1	3	
West Bengal		2		2	3	8	
Goa							
Himalaya Nagaland							
NEFA/NWFA						2	1
Kashmir							
Baluchistan							
Punjab(P)					1	2	
Sind							1
Unspecified sub-national	1			3			

INDOLOGY

GENERAL 4.0	POLITICAL SCIENCE 4.1	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHRO. 4.2	ARTS 4.3	LANGUAGE LINGUISTICS 4.10	LITERATURE 4.12	RELIGION & PHILOS 4.13	SCI.& TECH. 4.14	Economics 4.6	Geography, 4.8	History 4.9
6	8	4	9	38	33	49	3	1	1	6
	Law Texts	Degraded Brahmans Caste and Occupation Cultural History of a Dynasty Marriage in Pali Literature	Sanskrit Drama and Theatre Epigraphy Numismatics				Psychology Gita's Psychology of Conduct Psychoanalytic Observations on Krishna's Childhood Psychoanalytic observations on the Valmikiramayanam	Land ownership in Ancient India	Analysis of Social Locations in the Bhagavadgita	Land Ownership, 19th Century study of Jains. Kalidasa and the Golden Age Modes of Sannyasis-Matha Reform 1584 Asoka and Capital Punishment Sanskrit Studies in Europe

LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

	GENERAL 10.0	COMPARATIVE 10.1	DESCRIP. 10.2	HISTORICAL 10.3	SOCIO. 10.4	PHONETICS 10.5	MORPHOL 10.6	SYNTAX 10.7	LEARNING 10.8
SOUTH ASIA	*1	*1			**1		***1		
INDIA	3			a_1			b_1		
PAKISTAN				c_1					
SRI LANKA	1				d_1			e_1	
NEPAL		f_1	g_1		1	h_1		i_1	
BANGLADESH									
AFGHANISTAN									

* unspecified ** creoliz. & area hypothesis ***study and translation , vocabulario da lingua Ca Sariam

[a] Grierson [b]Mirror Words [c]Indus Script [d]Portuguese Creoliz. [e]Portuguese Creoliz.

[f]Tibeto Burma [g]unspecified [h]Dardic [i]Newari

BALUCHI							1	.	
BENGALI				1		1		2	
DRAVIDIAN		7		1	1	1	1	2	
ENGLISH			1		1				
GUJARATI						1			
INDO-EUR.		6	1	7		1		2	
Kashmiri & HIMALYAN		3	*1			*1	**2	***1	
KANNADA		1			2	1	2		
MALAYALAM						1			
MARATHI			1		2			2	
MUNDA, TRIBAL		1	2		a_3	b_1		c_2	
NEPALI			2						
PALI							1		
PANJABI						1	1		
RAJASTHANI								1	
SANSKRIT		1	1	19		3	2	18	
SINHALESE	1					1		1	
SINDHI		1	1					1	
TAMIL	2				2		1	4	1
TELEGU		2			1	1			
URDU	1		1						
HINDI	1	4	2		3	2	3	10	4
CHANGING			e_1		f_1	g_2	h_4	i_3	

* Hayu, comparative high ASIA [a]Munda, Kova [b]GTA [c]Sora, Gorum

** Hayu comparative high ASR [e]Car Nicobarese [f]Awaditi, Kannauji

*** Kiranti [g]Konkani, Proto Gutob Remo Gtaq

[h]Ho, Khasi, Lushai [i]Dari, Hq Kacci

LITERATURE

	LITERATURE 12.0	CRITICISM 12.1	FICTION 12.2	FOLKLORE 12.3	POETRY 12.4	TRANSLATIONS AND CRITICAL EDITIONS 12.5	DRAMA 12.6
SOUTH ASIA	1						
INDIA							
PAKISTAN							
BANGLADESH							
SRI LANKA			1				
NEPAL			1	1			
INTERNATIONAL		8 (Gen. Criticism)					
BENGALI		10	1	1	3		2
ENGLISH		4	7	3	3		
HINDI		9	5	6	7	2	3
KANNADA		1	1			1	
MALAYALAM		1	1	1			
MARATHI			1		1	1	1
MUNDA					2		
ORIYA			1	1			
PALI		1		1 (Tibetan)			
PERSIAN		1			1		
PUNJABI			1				
SANSKRIT		17	4	1	6	7	6
TAMIL		4	3	2	4	2	
TELEGU					1		
URDU		5	5	1	5		
UNSPECIFIED		8	4	1	4	2	2

Anything in Urdu and Hindi categorized under Urdu

Tamil includes comparisons with Sanskrit

POLITICAL SCIENCE

	General	Individual Political Figures	Political Parties	Electoral Behavior	Political Behavior & Society	Foreign Policy	Military Affairs	Politics of Resource Allocation	Adminis. Organiz. Institution	Levels of The Political System	Law
South Asia	4			1		8	3	1		1	
India	17(5)	8(2)	24(7)	10	43(15)	24(12)	6(3)	27(6)	21(4)	11(2)	20(4)
Pakistan	3	3(1)	4(1)		4	8		3	9(2)	2	1
Bangladesh	2	4			10	3	1	3	1		
Nepal	2(1)	1	1*			1		2	3(1)	2	
Afghanistan				1	3	1(1)	3(3)	1			1
Sri Lanka	3(1)		2	1	4(1)	1	1	2	4(3)	1	1
Bhutan						1					1
International	3(1)		1(1)		4(1)	8(1)		4(1)	2	2	4**
North India		2(2)	1(1)		10(6)			2		3(1)	
South India	1(1)		5(1)		2(1)				2(2)	2(2)	1(1)
West India					2(2)						
Andhra Pradesh					4(2)			1(1)	2(2)	3(3)	
Bengal		2(2)	6(4)	3(2)					4(4)	4(2)	1
Bihar				2	2(1)					1	
Gujarat	1(1)			1	3(3)					3(1)	
Haryana											1
Karnataka		1							1(1)	2	1
Kerala			1(1)						2(2)	2(1)	
Madhya Pradesh				1				1(1)*			
Maharashtra			2(1)		5(3)			1	1(1)	2(2)	
Orissa					1				1(1)	1	
Punjab			3(2)		2(1)		1	1		4(2)	1(1)
Rajasthan		1			2(1)			1		3(1)	
Tamil Nadu			2(1)		7(4)				3(3)	7(3)	1(1)
Uttar Pradesh			3(2)	2	5(3)				1	8(2)	
Baluchistan					1(1)						
Sind			1						1	1(1)	
Punjab(P)			1(1)	1					1	1(1)	

* Hindu Kuah

** U.S.-India (2) Greece-India (1) Egypt-Pakistan (1)

SOUTH ASIA - foreign affairs among the S.A. Nations
Country - foreign affairs between that country and country(s) outside the region.
International - foreign affairs affecting the region (the Indian Ocean) or between South Asia as a region and elsewhere (South Asia and the Middle East)

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK BY AREA EXPERTS

POLITICAL SCIENCE

	General	Individual Political Figures	Political Parties	Electoral Behavior	Political Behavior & Society	Foreign Policy	Military Affairs	Politics of Resource Allocation	Adminis. Organiz. Institution	Levels of the Political System	Law
South Asia	3(1)						2	3(1)	1		
India	6(2)	2(1)	10	7	10(3)	9(2)		10	8(2)	7(2)	1
Pakistan	1	1	2		2	2		1	1	1	1
Bangladash	1				2		1				
Napal						1				1	
Afghanistan					2(1)	1(1)	1(1)				
Sri Lanka	1		1		2(1)			1			
Bhutan											
International	1(1)					2		1			
North India		1(1)			4(3)			2		1	
South India		1(1)	1		2(1)			1(1)			
West India										1(1)	
Andhra Pradash					4(3)						
Bihar				1	1(1)						
Gujarat										3(1)	
Haryana											
Karnataka		1								1	
Kerala			1								
Madhya Pradesh					1						
Maharashtra			1		1(1)						
Orissa											
Punjab			2(1)							3(1)	
Rajasthan		2			2(1)			1		1	
Tamil Nadu					2(1)					2	
Uttar Pradash					2(2)				3(2)	2	
West Bengal			2(1)	2(1)					1(1)	1(1)	
Sind											
Punjab(P)			1		1(1)					1(1)	

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

	RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY 13.0	HINDUISM 13.1	BUDDHISM 13.2	ISLAM 13.3	ZOROASTRIAN 13.4	CHRISTIANITY 13.5	JAINISM 13.6	TEMPLES AND SHRINES 13.7	SECTS AND MOVEMENTS 13.8	RELIGION & PHILOS.TEXTS 13.9	RELIGION & PHILOS.CONCEPTS 13.j	SIKHS 13K
SOUTH ASIA			*29(1)			*11(2)						
INDIA	38(2)	23	4	13(3)	2	1(1)	7	3	16(3)	2	54	5
PAKISTAN		1		1		1		2			2	
BANGLADESH				1		*(1)						
SRI LANKA	1		5			1			1		1	
AFGHANISTAN				2				1			1	
SIKKIM			1			1						
BHUTAN		1				*(1)						
INTERNATIONAL	**2	***3			1	1		****2			****7	
NEPAL	1	5	3					1	1			

*General **India & West ***Overseas ****Hari Krisna *****Compares Contrasts starred parentheses *( ) also working elsewhere

ANDHRA		2				1(1)			1(1)			
BIHAR									2(1)			
CENTRAL INDIA		1										
KARNATAKA								1				
KASHMIR									2(1)			
KERALA				2(1)		3(1)			1			
MAHARASHTRA	1	3(1)	2		1				1			
NAGALAND						1(1)						
NORTH INDIA		5				1(1)			1			
ORISSA		1						2(1)				
PUNJAB		1(1)		2(1)		1(1)			1(1)			
RAJASTHAN	1(1)											
SOUTH INDIA		3		1	1			3(1)	3			
TAMIL NADU	1(1)	7(1)				3(1)		5(4)	3(1)			
UTTAR PRADESH		4	1									
WEST BENGAL	1	7(4)		1(1)		2(1)			7(2)			2
GUJARAT										36		

Starred parentheses=also working elsewhere = 2 people in South Asia

Hindu - 34 Islam 1
Buddhist 5 Sikh 1

COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA

	GENERAL 5.0	PRESS AND PUBLICATION 5.1	FILMS AND RADIO 5.2	COMMUNICATION 5.3
SOUTH ASIA	1			
INDIA		10 (1)	2	3 (1)
PAKISTAN				
BANGLADESH				
NEPAL				
SRI LANKA		2		
BENGAL		1 (1)		
KARNATAKA				1
MAHARASHTRA		1		
TAMIL NADU			4	
UTTAR PRADESH		1 (1)		

Information Fields
Impack of Cross Cultural Communication
Mass Media and Cultural Media
Soc. History of Communication

EDUCATION

	GENERAL 7.0	PLANNING POLICY CURRICULUM 7.1	EMPIRICAL AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES 7.2	DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES 7.3	SOUTH ASIA IN THE U.S. CURRICULUM INCL.TEACHING MATERIALS 7.4
SOUTH ASIA			1 Ind. & Bangladesh	1 Ind. and U.S.	
INDIA	2	10	3	14 (3)	1
PAKISTAN		3		1(1)	1
SRI LANKA				1	
NEPAL	1	1		2	
AFGHANISTAN	1	1	2		
GOA				1 (1)	
KARNATAKA		1		1 (1)	
MAHARASHTRA		1	1		
UTTAR PRADESH		1		4 (3)	
SOUTH INDIA		1			
WEST BENGAL			1	2 (2)	1
LANGUAGE					9
CIVILIZATION					2
RELIGION					2
In the School System					2
METHODOLOGY					2
BIBLIOGRAPHY					1
ANTHROPOLOGY					1

Problems of U.S. Scholars in India, Foreign Asst. to Afghan, Study of Ind. Philosophy in Germany and Austria, Resources for Nepali Education development

LIBRARIES AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

	Archives and Libraries		Sources and Bibliographies
	11.0	11.1	11.2
SOUTH ASIA			3
INDIA	1	3	14
PAKISTAN			1
BANGLADESH		2	1
SRI LANKA			
NEPAL			
AFGHANISTAN			1
INTERNATIONAL		2 (in U.S.)	2 (Dumont, Ghadr in Calif.)
ANDHRA PRADESH		1	
BENGAL			
BIHAR			2
GOA		1	
KERALA			
MAHARASHTRA		1	
PUNJAB			3
RAJASTHAN			3
UTTAR PRADESH			1
HINDI			1
SANSKRIT			6

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

	SCI. & TECHNOLOGY 14.0	ENVIRON. 14.1	GEOLOGY 14.2	MEDICINE 14.3	NUTRITION 14.4	PUBLIC HEALTH 14.5	PSYCH. 14.7	ANIMAL & AGRICUL. 14.8
SOUTH ASIA			1	1				
INDIA	3(1)	3		9	1	7	18	5
NEPAL		3		4		4		
PAKISTAN		1				1	1	
BANGLADESH								2
SRI LANKA						1		
INTERNATIONAL						2	5	
WEST BENGAL-		1		3				
PUNJAB				1(1)		1	1	
NORTH INDIA				1(1)			1	
SOUTH INDIA				1	1	1	1	
TAMIL NADU				1				
ANDHRA PRADESH				1				
UTTAR PRADESH					1			
KERALA						1		
GUJARAT							1	1
PUNJAB(P)							1	

Combines theoretical speculations (Jung and Mahyana Buddhism and experimental, analytic, etc.)

REFERENCES

1. Richard D. Lambert, Language and Area Studies Review, Monograph No. 17 (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1973), pp. 380-381.

2. Ibid, p. 11.

3. Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman, "The Preservation of the Cosmopolitan Research University in the United States," in Richard D. Lambert (ed.), New Directions in International Education, ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (May 1980), p. 58.

4. Lambert, Op.Cit., p. 59

5. Barber and Ilchman, Op.Cit., p. 67

6. Ibid., p. 76.