

AAWH Plenary Panel Session: Education and World History: A Comparative Perspective

Organized by Shiro Momoki
(Osaka University, Japan)

After the end of the 20th Century, the nation-state-based and Euro-centric historiography which had long dominated textbooks of World History lost its authority and adequacy due to the advance of the globalizing power and the rapid modernization of non-Western regions. However, current trend of globalization appears to be causing an exodus from the classrooms of history rather than a widespread evolution of more globalized views on World History.

Many Japanese senior high schools were disclosed in 2006 that they were not teaching World History, an obligatory subject. It reveals the dislike and disappointment of high school teachers and students to the subject of World History, such as the following message: World history “only teaches what happened in the past, therefore it is of no use for the future life of students”. Moreover, it is “too much complicated, therefore disadvantageous in university entrance examinations compared to other subjects like geography, Japanese history, and so forth” (in entrance exams, World History is a mere optional subject among subjects of social sciences).

Is this a peculiar situation only in Japan? If not, how can we cope with such an a-historical thought, by showing a really new model of World History historiography which might replace the conventional one? Our Association has to deal with this serious problem permanently. This session is arranged for initial discussions on this important subject with the participation of both professional historians and history teachers at senior high-schools.

We would like to discuss the following points at this session:

- (1) The West and non-Western countries and regions in mutual perceptions as well as in historical interactions;
- (2) Incorporation of national histories into World History by using the concept of regions;
- (3) Integration of new research fields (e.g. environmental history, gender, etc.) and new methodology (e.g. oral history and history of memories, etc.) into World History Education.

Revitalizing Historical Research and Education: A Challenge from Osaka

Shiro MOMOKI
(Osaka University)

The term “history education in Japan,” may remind participants from East Asian countries of famous (notorious) issues like high school textbook written from an ultra-nationalistic point of view, or territorial disputes between Japan and other East Asian countries. Participants from Japanese academia, on the other hand, may simply think about the pedagogic issues of high school, which seemingly have nothing to do with their academic research in universities. As the first paper of our session, however, this paper deals with more general frameworks and contexts of historical research and education (focusing on the education in both high schools and universities) in Japan. Without such a wider consideration, the author is afraid, both academic research and education in history will decline in the near future, while mutual understanding among East Asian people will also remain partial and superficial.

1. Some General Aspects of Historical Research and Education in Japan: Development and Crisis

Thanks to the pre-Meiji (especially the early modern) academic tradition and the swift transplantation of modern European systems after the Meiji Restoration in 1868, historical research and education developed rapidly in modern Japan.

Universities (including history departments and university-affiliated research institutes) have played the major roles in academic research, while French- (and Russian-) style social science academies and other research institutes outside universities have not developed so much. As the object of research and education, the famous tripartite system was established around 1900 after a period of exploration into various kinds of history including *Bankokushi* 倭邦史 (history of nations) and *Sekaishi* (world history). Under the tripartite system, *Kokushi* 国史 (National History or Japanese History)¹ has occupied the predominant position.

1 After World War II, National History in high schools was renamed as Japanese History (*Nihonshi* 日本史) in order to remove its ultra-nationalistic character. Nevertheless, it was only after the 1980s that departments (or courses) of *National History* in Japanese national universities were renamed because the nation-state-oriented way of thought was so deep-rooted even in the “Postwar Historiography 戦後史学” strongly influenced by

However, *Seiyoshi* 躑跼(Western History or European and North American History) has also been studied eagerly as the model of modernization. Courses in the historic theories and thoughts have usually been taught by professors of European History. Though research in *Toyoshi* 檄跼 (Eastern History or Asian History, mainly focusing on the Sinic World) has occupied only the third place, it has long developed as an independent sub-division of historical research and education, rather than part of Oriental (Asian) studies.²

Today, Japanese academic interest covers most regions and periods of world history, as shown in huge publications like *World History of Nations* 倨磴囂(28 vols, published by Yamakawa Shuppansha since 1998-) and *Iwanami Lectures in World History* 彦炒遣偏倨磴囂 (28 vols, published by Iwanami Shoten during 1997-2000). This is also the case of senior high school (10th to 12th grades) textbooks of World History, a compulsory subject for all high schools.³ Since 1999, the Ministry of Education enforced an ambitious guideline (which will be introduced by Prof. Kondo later) in which many recent research trends, such as European-style social history and World-System theory of American origin were incorporated into the curriculum.

Despite such traditions, historical studies and education in Japan have stagnated (rather, declined in some aspects) in recent years.

Newspapers and TV programs seldom invite historians to discuss national and international issues. In universities, students are less interested in history (and humanities in general) than before. In particular, the number of students in Asian History courses (along with such courses as Chinese Literature and Chinese Philosophy) is decreasing sharply due to a) the younger generation's disaffection with East Asian countries' (supposed) "anti-Japan"

Marxist theories. In the case of language and literature, *National Language* 好辨 and *National Literature* 好艳 岐 are still taught and studied with less criticism.

2 Since the end of the 19th century, both the history departments of universities and history as a subject in high schools were divided into National, Western and Eastern Histories. After 1949, high school foreign histories were integrated into *Sekaiishi* 倨磴囂 (World History), while the tripartite system remained intact in universities.

3 In the present scheme (famous for the slogan of "Elbowroom Education (丸ヲ水祝蒲," which rejects the uniform "cramming education 轆四鎧(二祝蒲" of earlier decades and instead encourages diversification) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology or *Monbu-Kagaku-sho* 艳陌絞岐童 (hereafter abbreviated as Ministry of Education), junior high students study the subject Social Studies 糰儔絞, which includes Geography, History (mostly Japanese history) and Civics (politics and law, economy, and so on). In senior high schools, however, this is separated into the subject groups of "Geography and History 秘睨磴囂" (including Geography, Japanese History, and World History) and "Civics 卞瀑" (including Contemporary Society 睡登糰儔, Politics and Economics 柝灑膝爭, and Ethics 到睨). All three subjects of the group "Geography and History" have two courses, that is, course A (2 credits) and course B (4 credits). Courses A of both Japanese History and World History mainly cover modern and contemporary history, while courses B cover from ancient times to the present. Students must study World History (A or B) and one preferred course of either Geography or Japanese History.

sentiment and policies, and b) the severe decline of the teaching of classical Chinese.⁴

A considerable number of senior high schools were disclosed in 2006 that they had omitted teaching certain subjects in order to concentrate on subjects necessary and advantageous for university entrance examination. It was World History (a compulsory subject!⁵) that was omitted in most high schools, due to its “disadvantage” for university entrance examination.⁶ Even the more “obedient” high schools have many difficulties in teaching history. They usually teach World History course A to all students in the first or second grade and then teach World History course B to the students of social sciences and humanities in the second or third grade (often to those who will select World History in the university entrance exam.). However, methods for teaching World history A (a new subject founded in 1989) are still underdeveloped. In many high schools, only half of the course B content is taught.⁷ Students (and teachers as well) are often reluctant to study/teach course A,

4 Before 1945, every educated person in Japan could understand *Kanbun* 猿轂 or classical Chinese with *kundoku* 幹辻 annotation (a traditional method of translation into classical Japanese, which was commonly used in the everyday linguistic life of the Japanese) without learning Chinese conversation. The spread of the *kundoku* method underpinned the development of Japanese Sinology and its overwhelming dominance in Japanese Asian studies. However, it is now quite difficult even for excellent students in humanities to learn how to read classical Chinese with the *kundoku* method, which is no longer popular in their Americanized cultural and linguistic life. Therefore, the majority of Asian History sections, where professors are not interested in regions other than China but do not speak Chinese fluently (nor English), can no longer attract students today.

5 This news brought to the attention of a number of would-be patriotic political and economic leaders that while World History was compulsory in high schools, Japanese History was not. They began to demand that Japanese History should replace World History as a compulsory subject. What they do not know is that History taught in junior high schools is largely restricted to Japanese history (world history was also taught till the 1980s). On the other hand, they still suppose all senior high students study 4 credits of World History as they did several decades ago, despite the fact that there are so many students who only study course A (Last year, 864,495 copies of the textbooks of World History A were sold, while only 522,901 copies of the textbooks of World History B were sold).

6 In the entrance exam of private universities, Geography and History is required only for small part of candidates. In the “Center Examination 祝(女)南興” (examination administered by the National Center of University Entrance Examination), the candidate has to take a number of subjects designated by the university he or she wishes to enter. It is obligatory for candidates of national universities as the first phase of the entrance examination, before the second phase organized separately by each university. In order to gather more candidates, many private universities select candidates based only on the score in a few subjects at the Center Exam, or through the admission system. World History (course B is required for most universities) is merely a selective subject for almost all national universities. Every year, fewer than 100,000 candidates select World History B (with a few thousands of candidates of World History A) among more than 500 thousand candidates of the Center Exam. Other students and the majority of high school teachers feel the scope of World History is too broad to understand, while that of Japanese History and Geography is more concise and thus easier to study.

7 Many teachers omit Asian history, with which they themselves are not familiar, and only teach “more important” Western history. Moreover, Geography (both in junior high and senior high) has already abandoned the former scheme to teach about all major areas in the world. Instead, teachers select and teach about a few countries as examples, while spending more time on topic-oriented studies like industrialization and ecology,

a subject “not necessary for the entrance exam.” University teachers in liberal arts therefore lament that students do not remember anything about world history. In course B, in turn, few teachers can cover the entire curriculum due to a shortage of time (while part of course A is often repeated in course B) and the complexity of content required for entrance exam. Very few students have the chance to study contemporary history after World War II which comes in the end of the curriculum.

Under such conditions, more and more younger people became indifferent to history. First of all, to study history means the monotonous memorization of things past, a task which does not appear to have any meaning for present and future. Moreover, younger people, who grew up with an Americanized lifestyle, show little interest in things historic even in the sphere of amusement, in contrast to their elders, many of whom became interested in history through novels, movies or TV dramas. Finally, the political conflict among Asian countries focusing on history made many students “disgust” with “Asia” and “History,” although the ultra-nationalistic theory in Japan only attracted a small number of students.⁸

Besides the failure of the Ministry of Education in introducing its new scheme too impetuously without sufficiently reeducating teachers, there are a number of reasons in academia and pedagogic circles that have led to the crisis of history education.

First, the majority of scholars and teachers are still restrained by deep-rooted frameworks such as nation-state oriented historiography, Eurocentric paradigms, and the absolute division between Japanese history and world (foreign) history. High school teaching in general still maintains the Meiji framework of competition among World Powers (a framework to foster European-modeled first-class male adults with detailed Western knowledge and a little information about Asia), covered superficially with abstract idealism after World War II (which advocated more European-style modernization of Japanese society, despite its sympathy with Asian anti-colonialism). New theories and frameworks which have appeared recently are only introduced fragmentally, causing much confusion with old frameworks and contents. Students are still obliged to learn by heart details of Greek and Roman histories as the universal model of human history, while recent exciting research in Intra-Asian trade is

urban society, how to use the GIS system, and so forth. Therefore, it is quite possible for a student to finish high school without any knowledge of Asia, despite the general policy of the government that advocates more “internationalization” (along with a sufficiently patriotic mind). And in liberal arts studies in universities, History and Asian Studies are merely selective subjects, in which Japanese professors seldom teach the total view of the subject, only displaying fragments of his/her craftsmanship.

8 Under the competitive system of high school textbooks issued by private companies (with the inspection of the Ministry of Education), the famous ultra-nationalistic history textbook for junior high school is taught only to several thousand out of more than one million students every year. Explanations of Asian history and its relationship with Japan in most textbooks have been extended and improved since the 1990s. Today’s crisis of

seldom taught. The lack of understanding of Asian history (along with the relatively detailed but too conventional teaching of Chinese history) in turn contributes to maintaining the conventional view of Japanese history that Japan was always isolated from the outside and evolved only with its internal momentum. Based on such high school education, university students of history departments naturally choose their research field from “our own” conventional Japanese history or “advanced and elegant” European history more often than from “underdeveloped and poor” Asian history.⁹ Such selections are, however, not welcomed even by the government and business leaders who are (too) keen on the direct use of education (for doing business with Asian countries, for instance). This is apparently one basic reason for the recent isolation of history in Japanese society.

Second come peculiar Japanese values like *syokunin-katagi* 葬徳澆醜 or the craftsman’s dedication and *Bushido* 滄容鑱 or the samurai spirit (both praise industrious/selfless silence rather than conscious talkativeness. Those who pursue one small thing throughout life are highly admired), and egalitarianism or belief in uniformity (one must have the same things as his/her neighbor has). Based on these values, most of the time in every stage of education and training is spent on the uniform teaching of a narrow compulsory curriculum. Only those who have mastered it perfectly (*perfectly* by meticulous Japanese standards) are allowed broader explorations. Trained in such a system, all but a few outstanding scholars only know how to make empirical study of narrow topics in one of the “major” fields (*major* by nineteenth-century standards?¹⁰) and write “professional” articles full of jargon in his/her own

history education in Japan does not derive from textbooks themselves.

9 This judgement may anger historians in Japanese and Western Histories. I do know well that there are many renovations in these fields. Research and education in these fields are by no means unnecessary. Nevertheless, the majority is still too conventional. I do not think more scholars are necessary (as were before the 1970s) for the study of isolated Japanese history or for the introduction (or imitation) of European/ United-States history than for the research in Asian history, which, except for parts of Chinese and Korean histories, is still poorly studied. For example, there are only around 15 specialists in Southeast Asia, a crucial region for Japanese economy and society, in history departments of Japanese universities, while German and French histories have hundreds of specialists there. At the same time, however, scholars in Asian history have to make great efforts to overcome their own weak points: when they criticize Euro-centric grand theories of world history, most of them only emphasize the inherent nature of their own field, or at best, propose new “centrism” focusing on their own field (China-centrism, Islam-centrism, India-centrism and so forth) at the expense of other Asian regions.

10 An astonishingly large proportion of teaching positions in Western History courses are still assigned to specialists in Ancient Greek or Roman, medieval or modern British, French, German, Russian and US histories. In Eastern History courses of most universities, there are at best only one or two seat(s) assigned to specialists in “other countries or regions than China”. Japanese History courses are still eager to have specialists in the domestic history of major periods. Because the number of teaching staff is usually small (only a few history departments have more than 20 members), scholars in “minor” fields like Japanese external relationships, gender history, the history of countries and regions other than the above-mentioned “major” countries, seldom secure tenure in a history department. They are usually scattered in other departments, schools or research institutes (of

field; they lack enough training in studying grand theories on the one hand and “minor” fields on the other. Other types of trainings, like teaching, research review and evaluation, and academic translation/interpretation, are also insufficient. Moreover, the historian is no exception to the general poverty of Japanese intellectuals in the skill of expression, explanation and discussion. The number of historians who are able to write good textbooks and readings,¹¹ to make good questions for examinations,¹² or to give a good account of themselves to the government and society (these tasks all require broad views and skills other than writing narrow professional articles), is quite small. It is also natural that high school teachers who only studied a narrow and fixed part of “major” histories in university have difficulty when they teach new and “minor” histories. Education and professional training at the university level (in humanities in general) are still informed by traditional craftsmanship, whereby the master does not teach, and the apprentice has to imitate the master’s skill (or steal the master’s secrets). Systematic teaching is often criticized as stifling the self-training of the student. Scholars and teachers trained in such a way have been petrified by people’s extreme belief in “fair” marking of examinations, according which it is too difficult to mark “fairly” a question which requires a long answer including explanation or judgement; and thus only simple questions about names and dates are “fair” ones.¹³

Foreign Language and Culture, or International Studies, for instance).

11 High school textbooks (mainly written by professional scholars) are not usually organized well, despite the approval of the Ministry of Education (which also lacks the ability to examine new and minor fields). There is no university textbook or research guidebook (nor courses) in World History due to the preconception of professors that every university course must be organized based on a thorough survey of related individual studies (!). Most so-called university textbooks of history only deal with European history of thought (Hegel, Karl Marx, Max Weber, E.H. Karr and so forth) unless they are random collections of famous articles. In the case of Japanese History, there are several well-organized series of textbooks and research guidebooks, but they are too detailed for those who specialize in foreign history to grasp general issues or research trends in Japanese History.

12 There is a regrettable situation of mutual-reproach between high schools and universities: high school teachers cannot help but oblige students solely to memorize historical events and dates “due to the style of entrance examination” (the most stupid one is the Center Exam, which is arranged for the purpose of quick computer marking. But most questions in the second phase also test memory simply with the style “fill in the blanks” or “select the right answer”). University scholars in turn, make questions for entrance examinations which only test the memory of applicants, “because only memorizing is taught in high schools.” Both sides believe teaching and examination should require more “thinking” of students, and each blames the other side for their failure. In my opinion, however, not only high school teachers, but also university scholars are not good at inspiring thinking, explaining and discussing among students. The lack of the necessary skill for such purposes among university scholars is clearly shown by the wrong or inadequate questions (and explanations in textbooks too) that appear quite often when they try to make questions outside the conventional formats.

13 There is a striking difference between Japan and other East Asian countries. In Japan, people only memorize words, names and dates (in case of World History, the famous lexicon published by Yamakawa Shuppansha is the Bible of both teachers and students), while in other countries, especially where they have a tradition of pre-modern civil examination, people have to memorize sentences and passages.

2. A Challenge from Osaka

Many scholars and teachers have already perceived the crisis. In the case of natural sciences, they are coping with people's indifference to and ignorance of science collectively and continuously. In history (and humanities in general), however, the famous collectivism and consistency of the Japanese is seldom displayed, although there are exceptions in a number of high school teachers' societies (as will be introduced by Mr. Yoshimine and Ishibashi)¹⁴ and research institutes/societies.¹⁵ As was the case of medieval *samurai* soldiers, everyone fights individually or in small group. In other words, the tradition of the decentralized feudal system, a system which did not develop in other East Asian countries, is still dominant. Moreover, the recent neo-libertarian reform of education (combined with traditional East-Asian bureaucratism, under which documentation and official approval are necessary before anything can be made, and poverty of supply like the Japanese army before 1945) has left scholars and teachers, already unfamiliar with a collective style of working, too busy to collaborate effectively.

In such a situation, the recent challenge undertaken by our history department at Osaka University is quite remarkable, though it might look like self-congratulation.¹⁶ Osaka city is a famous centre of business and pragmatism. For this reason, study of the humanities at Osaka University is by no means as strong or famous as that of Kyoto (and Tokyo).¹⁷ Yet, its history

14 Recent discussion in pedagogic circles seems to focus on the *abstract* goals of education on the one hand, and practical methods to organize *one* hour of *one* class. Despite the drastic changes in guidelines and textbooks in terms of contents, discussion about what should be taught and what should be changed within the entire curricula of a school is stagnant.

15 Prof. Minamizuka Shingo 宮嶺準因 established the Research Institute for World History 倨磴嚙篤緯攝 (<http://www.history.l.chiba-u.jp/~riwh/english/>) in 2004 to enhance the research and education of world history and to combine them with local histories of Japan. Senshu University 廖几窩帛 (Tokyo) also founded the Research Center for History 榮嚙帛篤緯攝 (<http://www.senshu-u.ac.jp/~off1020/home-jp.html>) and the Research Center for East Asia Regional History 橄自㊟自倨磴嚙篤緯攝 (<http://www.senshu-u.ac.jp/~off1024/>). The Japan Society for Western History 梲槽踳焯嚙帛儔 held a symposium on history education in 2007 and is planning another one for 2010. On last Sunday, Rekishigaku Kenkyukai 榮嚙帛篤緯儔 (The Historical Science Society in Japan, a famous leftist society) held a symposium entitled "60 Years of World History Education in Japan."

16 It has already been introduced in Japanese in Momoki and Sato (eds.) 2007; Momoki 2009; Osaka Rekishi Kagaku Kyogikai 嚙髮榮嚙絞帛啣違儔 2009, and reviewed in major journals of history like *Shigaku Zasshi* 嚙帛緇緇 (Haneda 2008), *Nihon Rekishi* 梲槽榮嚙 (Konno Yasuharu 2009), and *Rekishigaku Kenkyu* 榮嚙帛篤緯 (Mimamizuka Shingo 2009).

17 Osaka University (famous for medical science and engineering) is proud of being one of "the Seven Imperial Universities" (Tokyo, Kyoto, Hokkaido, Tohoku, Nagoya, Osaka and Kyushu) which were founded before 1945. However, schools of social sciences and humanities in Osaka and Nagoya were founded only after 1945 as "New Universities" were founded, and they remain small. Therefore, only candidates (mainly from western Japan) with lower scores in Center Exam than candidates for Kyoto enter schools of humanities and social sciences at Osaka. They often show a clear inferiority complex to the students of Kyoto and Tokyo. However, the History group of the School of Humanities, Osaka University currently has three sections, namely, Japanese History, World History

group has created new systems and launched novel projects.

First of all, no member of the teaching staff does nation-state-oriented research. In Japanese academia of history, especially since the 1990s, Osaka University has been famous for a) macroscopic research in such fields as like modern Global history and the World system, central Eurasia, and maritime Asia on the one hand,¹⁸ and b) microscopic (often fieldwork-based) research in fields like Kansai (Japan),¹⁹ the delta areas in Jiangnan (the lower Yangtze River) and Guangdong in China, and in Taiwan on the other. However, if each group only works within its own territory, the same problem as in nation-state-oriented research will appear. Therefore, discussions among different fields are often arranged in seminars and research meetings, central Eurasia with Maritime Asia, Maritime Asia with the European expansion, and the Islands of Japan with Southeast Asia, for example. Many fields have benefited from such “battle royals.” For instance, “Chinese history” in the sense of monolithic empire or nation-state has been deconstructed through the crossfire from nomadic

(including Eastern History and Western History) and Archeology, with 20 permanent teaching staff in total, along with a number of historians who are affiliated to other departments or schools like Japanese Studies, Economic History, and Foreign Studies. Especially thanks to the unification with Osaka University of Foreign Studies 寓髮婁奘辨寓帔 in 2007, the variety of specialized fields among historians became broadest of all Japanese universities.

18 Immanuel Wallerstein’s theory of the Modern World System was first introduced in Japan in the early 1980s by the then professor Kawakita Minoru 桃畹綜 of Osaka Univ. Now, Akita Shigeru 経磯崎, together with Sugihara Kaoru 標噴触 in Kyoto, is leading the research into the global economic history of modern times. With brilliant studies of multi-lingual sources in pre-Islamic central Eurasia by Moriyasu Takao 民幡聿窺 (together with Sugiyama Masaaki 標壽藩梵 from Kyoto), a dramatic renaissance of Silkroad study has taken place in last two decades. The Maritime Asia group started working in 1993, and in 2008 it published an introduction to the research of maritime Asian history (probably for the first time in the world) [Momoki-Yamauchi-Fujita-Hasuda (eds.) 2008]. Many achievements of these groups were introduced in Kaitokudo Kinenkai (ed.) 2008 to citizens and in the first AAWH congress to professional scholars.

19 The Kansai-based studies of Osaka scholars (in the formation of the early state in the Yayoi and Kofun Periods by Tsude Hiroshi 陆叶瀟团劫 and Fukunaga Shinya 紀溼備珂; Medieval *Kwenmon* 浼騰 [political], *Sho-en* 蛸妒 [economic], and *Kenmitsu* 鶻度 [religious] systems by Kuroda Toshio 碓洗鮠 and Taira Masayuki 憐鮎甞; and early modern economy and society by Wakita Osamu 蒿磯几 and Murata Michihito 楠磯鈍僵, for instance) have successfully revised former dominant theories of Japanese history established in Tokyo (and partly in Kyoto). The most spectacular change in recent textbooks in Japanese History probably took place in the chapter on the “early medieval” period 倭倭吳椽 (the late Heian and Kamakura Periods or the 11th to Early 14th Centuries). The “feudal” landlord system 鶻倭吵 of Samurai class and the “New Buddhism 桓僅椽” (represented by the Pure-land Sect and the Zen Sect) are no longer dominant frameworks of research. Instead, a *mandala*-like political-economic-social system, which is quite comparable with that of early Southeast Asia (cf. Wolters 1999), is being studied. This system was a loose federation (often accompanied by conflicts) of various Powers (*kwenmon*), such as the emperor and aristocrats, samurais, and “Old” (Tantric) Buddhist sects. Every power had its own economic base (*shoen* manors) and military apparatus. These studies should be read not only by foreign historians specializing in Japanese history but also by those specializing in Asian history, because they have many implications for related Asian topics. To realize this, of course, Osaka people should make more efforts to publish their works in English.

soldiers and oasis merchants in the north and the west, seafaring people and maritime merchants in the east and the south, and semi-Han peasants in Guangdong and Taiwan. Collaboration and discussion with foreign scholars are also active, not only in Global and Western histories and Silkroad/central Eurasian histories, specialists of which usually speak foreign language(s) well. The Maritime Asian history group has also been trying to organize international collaborations, involving people in Japanese and East Asian histories,²⁰ who often “fear” English conversation (like me!).

Second, systematic special education is provided both for undergraduate and graduate students (this is a rare phenomenon in humanities in Japan!). In the case of Eastern History, the current system was set up in the end of the 1990s. In this system, central Eurasia, China, and Southeast/Maritime Asia are treated as three major branches, based on the specialty of the teaching staff. Undergraduate students are required to take the elementary coursework of all three branches in the first and second grades (in the framework of liberal arts²¹), and are also recommended to take special lecture courses in all branches from the second grade on. In the second and third grades, all students are required to learn classical Chinese. They are also required to select one of three branches²² to attend a class of English readings (and class of other foreign language(s), if necessary²³) and prepare a BA thesis under the supervision of related teaching staff. Students in the fourth grade are expected to spend most of time doing his/her own research and writing the thesis. In the case of graduate students, they usually study one of the three branches, mainly through research seminars held by individual supervisors. However, graduates of other universities with more narrow training (for instance, few other departments of Eastern History have a course of Southeast Asian history) are recommended to take pertinent necessary undergraduate coursework. Finally, all undergraduate and graduate students (and teaching staff) are required to attend a presentation seminar held on every Thursday, in which students in each grade have a specific obligation to present their research.

20 Though not all scholars and graduate students in Eastern History are good English speakers, everyone is able to make a presentation or write a paper in an Asian language, for example, Chinese for the specialists in Chinese and the Silkroad histories, and Vietnamese for me.

21 The curriculum of liberal arts covers the first one year and a half. However, students have to select a major at the end of the first grade and take a few courses in special education in the first half of the second grade.

22 Those who wish to specialize in the history of other regions like the Middle East or India are also welcome. They are allowed to attend classes by related specialists at another school or university, and to be supervised by them. If necessary, such students are exempted from obligatory courses in our department, for example, the course of classical Chinese.

23 Students who specialize in Chinese history are strongly expected to learn modern spoken Chinese, which is also tested in the entrance examination of graduate school. Students in central Eurasia and Southeast Asia are also encouraged to learn European language(s) other than English and Asian local language(s) such as Turkish, Tibetan, Vietnamese, or Thai.

For instance, students in the second and third grade of the Ph.D. course, in addition to presenting their dissertation plans, have to give lectures for undergraduate students on such topics as the academic history of Asian historical research, and major sources in Asian history.

When the new system was set up, there had been little collaboration in education across the entire history group. For this reason, a number of new classes in the subjects “Methodology of Historical Research” and “World History” were opened as joint courses for the entire history group, aimed at providing students with an up-to-date general view and skill in historical research. For instance, in the second grade, all undergraduate students majoring history have to take the lecture course “Theories and Methodology of Historical Research.” Graduate students are recommended to attend “The Frontiers of Historical Research” (a joint-lecture course with scholars in foreign studies, discussing how to deconstruct nation-state-oriented history), and “Research Seminar in History Education” which will be mentioned below. Through such training, students in the Eastern History major acquire not only basic knowledge and skill in historical research in general and Asian history in particular (and basic skill in academic English), but also deeper specific knowledge and skill in their own specialty (including skill in Asian language(s)).

Our third challenge is collaboration with high school teachers, the major aim of which is to provide the school teachers with up-to-date information and teaching materials about major issues in world (including Japanese) history.²⁴ Lectures on the above-mentioned strong fields of Osaka scholars were welcomed by high school teachers because most of these fields were introduced into or enlarged in high school history education only recently (and are not yet taught systematically in other universities), and are therefore difficult to understand even for high school teachers.²⁵ From 2003 to 2006, we held a summer seminar every year, in which teachers from 43 of Japan’s 47 prefectures, together with a number of textbook editors and preparatory school teachers, participated at least once.²⁶ In the autumn of 2005, a new

24 A number of historians in Osaka University had already written high school textbooks. Although their academic quality is higher than other examination-oriented textbooks, the Osaka textbooks were not successful in sales competition with other textbooks. And high school teachers often criticized Osaka textbooks because they are too novel for them. Without detailed commentary about how they differ from old theories and explanations, the teachers can never teach with such textbooks.

25 Another difficulty with teachers comes from their age. As a result of the financial crisis of the government and the sharp decrease in the birth rate, few young teachers have been recruited for almost three decades. Therefore, the majority of teachers in many high schools are over 50 years old now, and it is difficult for them to understand new issues like European social history, maritime Asian history, and gender and women’s history, for instance. The rejection of new issues by high school teachers is apparently one of the major reasons why history (especially World History) was not taught in many high schools.

26 See, <http://www.let.osaka-u.ac.jp/toyosi/main/seminar/index.html>. These seminars were held in the framework of the 21st century COE (center of excellence) program^ス Interface Humanities of our graduate school (undertaken in

collaborative project named “Osaka University Research Project in History Education”(髯髮髯帔榮嚏祝蒲篤緯儔)²⁷ started with the participation of high school teachers from Osaka, Kyoto, Hyogo, Kanagawa, Hokkaido and other prefectures. Every month, a semi-closed seminar is held at Osaka University, with such lectures and reports on recent research trends in a specific topic, teacher’s reports about new issues introduced in this project, and reports on supra-prefectural or international collaborations in history teaching. Teaching materials in such fields as Southeast Asian history, modern world system, and Japan in world history, were and are being made by the project members. Collaboration with prefectural teachers’ societies are also active, the most remarkable one being the joint open lectures for high school students accompanied by seminars with teachers held in Kanagawa in 2007 and 2008. Though “high school-university collaboration” has been a phrase in vogue in recent years, such continuous collaboration appears to be rare outside pedagogic schools/faculties.

Graduate students, not only those who wish to become high school teachers, have been involved in this project, especially since 2007, when a new graduate course in history education was opened in the reorganization which followed the unification with Osaka University of Foreign Studies. Students who participate in the monthly seminars and make assigned presentations can get credit for the course in history education (for MA students) or the world history course (for Ph.D) students. In future, if a student writes an excellent dissertation and gets a teaching job at a university, he/she must teach the liberal arts courses on the one hand, and on the other persuade university leaders and administrative officers of the importance of history. For this purpose, discussion with high school teachers is a better training than that with professional historians because teachers have considerably deep knowledge of a specialty (sometimes as deep as that of a Ph.D candidate), together with the skill to talk with people who do not major in history. Their general view of world history is also apparently broader than any graduate student’s (and most professional scholars’).

Finally, we have started to reorganize the teaching of history in the liberal arts.²⁸ All

2002-2006), a program that was aimed at strengthening collaboration with citizens outside academia. The final report of the history group in this program is Momoki and Sato (eds.) 2007.

27 For its website (in Japanese), see <http://www.geocities.jp/rekikyō/>.

28 When Japanese university education was reorganized after World War II, American-style liberal arts education was introduced (usually undertaken in the first two years after entrance, in the charge of a college of liberal arts 祝慶院). As university education became more popular, however, liberal arts education (without sufficient instruction to individual students and careful linkage with specialized education) became less effective. Its curricula were reorganized and the college of liberal arts was abolished in most universities in the 1990s. Under the current system of Osaka University, members of teaching staff in every school are to rotate to take charge of related classes in liberal arts under the direction of the Practical Center for University Education. In the humanities, however, contents of various subjects are usually less systematized and instructions to students are usually inconsistent. Therefore it is difficult for students to acquire anything but disconnected fragments of specialized research.

foreign history courses in liberal arts used to be organized on the assumption that students who selected these classes had studied World History B in high school; and the Japanese history courses were based on the assumption that every student had studied Japanese History B. The teacher in liberal arts only needed to overthrow students' conventional and examination-oriented knowledge with examples of professional study within his/her narrow specialty. As mentioned above, however, such assumptions are no longer adequate since 1989 (!). Teachers of Asian History, for example, now have to teach many students who have studied very little about Asia. In the first semester of 2007, we opened one class in Asian history (Asian History Necessary for Citizens) and another in European History (European History Necessary for Citizens) among the "Basic Subjects." Students who have not studied World History B are expected to attend these classes, where teachers teach general features and topics in the designated areas with a common high school textbook (of course without memorizing but with enough theoretical explanations). Since 2008, this group has gradually expanded, to four courses in the year 2009 (class A to D of World History Necessary for Citizens), in order to cover most of world history from ancient to modern times. Japanese history has also opened two classes of "Japanese History necessary for Citizens since 2008. Among "International Subjects," three classes called "History Necessary for Cosmopolites" were opened in 2008 to teach the general features of modern and contemporary history in major regions in the world. In sum, around one half of the liberal arts subjects in history are now assigned for "remedial" teaching of basic features for students who studied world history or Japanese history quite insufficiently (or not at all) in high school, while other half deal with more specific fields or topics (along with "elementary courses in special education").

Conclusion

The present situation in Japan clearly shows that academia in the field of history will lose the social basis of its survival and reproduction if it still continues to insist on "pure academic research" regardless of education, both in primary and secondary schools and in universities. Of course, we cannot overlook the responsibility of the government, which has allocated the poorest budget for education (compared to GDP) among OECD countries on the one hand, and on the other launched too ad hoc an "educational reform" without a scrupulous total design. However, teachers and scholars, despite their capability and enthusiasm, also seem to lack a broad vision and be too much monotonous in teaching and research.

In high schools, the debates on which subjects should be compulsory are fruitless, given that it is impossible to assure enough time for students to study all subjects of the group

“Geography and History” or the group “Civics”.²⁹ Rather, a total revision of subjects in junior high and senior high schools is necessary in order to assure minimum knowledge and skill related to (world) history for all students. For this purpose, some research societies have already started planning a new senior high compulsory subject like “Elements of History” in which both Japanese and world history are supposed to be integrated with each other. However, this can be fruitful only when it meshes well with university entrance examinations. Universities must assume the responsibility for doing this.

Universities and professional scholars are also responsible for the improvement of university education, especially in the liberal arts and the course for the teacher’s license, so that insufficient teaching in high schools can be remedied. Professional scholars are also required to provide (high school) teachers with better textbooks and teaching materials, which must be accompanied by handy information about recent research trends. These must cover the entire world history both in time and space, though it is not possible and necessary in the classroom to teach the entire history in every stage (junior high and senior high, for instance) and subject (world history A and B, for instance).

It is difficult for most history departments in Japan to achieve these tasks with their current personnel makeup. Both in specialized areas or fields (more specialists in “peripheral” areas and “new” fields are necessary) and in the form of work (more time and manpower must be spent on other work than narrow “specialized research”), a large-scale reorganization is inevitable. Otherwise, history departments will find themselves facing severe curtailment.

Finally, a simple introduction of European or American model(s) is not a fruitful solution for any issue. Rather, exchange of experiences and mutual consultation among Asian countries will help revitalize historical research and education in Japan.

29 People specializing in history should pay attention to the entire condition of high school education. There are many other things to do that were not required before, for example, computer training. And the contents of every subject are more complex than they were several decades ago, due to the development of science and society.

Bibliography

- Akita, Shigeru and Shiro Momoki (eds.) 2008. *Rekishigaku no Furontia: Chiiki kara Toinaosu Kokumin-kokka Shikan* (The Frontier of Historical Research: A Revision of Nation-state-oriented History from Regional Point of View), Osaka University Press.
- Haneda, Tadashi 2008. 'Rekishi Riron (Historic Theories)', *Shigaku Zasshi* 117 (5) (A Special Issue Overiewing Historical Research in Japan in 2007), pp. 5-9.
- Kaitokudo Kinenkai (ed.) 2008. *Sekaishi-o Kakinaosu, Nihonshi-o Kakinaosu: Handai Shigaku-no Chosen* (Rewriting World History and Japanese History: A Challenge of the Historical Research in Osaka University), Osaka: Izumi Shoin.
- Konno, Yasuharu 2009. 'Nihon-shi Kenkyu to Nihon-shi Kyoiku-o Tsunagu (To Combine the Research and Education in Japanese History)', *Nihon Rekishi* 728, pp.36-40.
- Minamizuka, Shigo 2009. 'Sekaishi wa Ugoiteiru (World History Is Changing)'. *Rekishigaku Kenkyu* 850, pp. 30-39.
- Momoki, Shiro 2009. *Wakaru Rekishi, Omoshiroi Rekishi, Yakunitatsu Rekishi: Rekishigaku to Rekihi Kyoiku-no Saisei-o Mezashite* (Understandable History, Interesting History, and Meaningful History: In Search of Revitalization of Historical Research and Education), Osaka University Press.
- Momoki, Shiro and Takayasu Sato (eds.) 2007. *Sekai-sisutemu to Kaiiki Ajia Kotsu* (Global History and Maritime Asia), Final Report Series No. 4, The 21st Century COE Program «Interface Humanities», Osaka University [Partly written in English].
- Momoki, Shiro, Shinji Yamauchi, Kayoko Fujita, and Takashi Hasuda (eds.) 2008. *Kaiiki Ajia-shi Kenkyu Nyumon* (An Introduction to the Research in Maritime Asian History), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten [Translation into Korean is now being planned].
- Osaka Rekishi Kagaku Kyogikai (Osaka Council of Historical Science) 2009. Tokushu: Rekishi-gaku to Rekishi-kyoiku no Aida (A Special Issue: Between History Research and History Education), *Rekishi Kagaku* (Historical Science) 197.
- Wolters, Oliver W. 1999. *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives* (revised ed.), Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.