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Abstract
This work is a case study for a model in the circulation of modern studies in East Asia, and in order to discover how Oriental history, which was a part of the three divisions of history (Western history, Oriental history and national history) formed by the Japanese Imperial University in the system of modern studies, underwent a change which is the cause of the present problem. This article examines the history of academias in Japan and Korea from the viewpoint that the formation of modern studies in East Asia arose from the interdependence and discord between two aspects, i.e. the study as a system and the study as a movement, and finally compares them with the study of history in China.
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Introduction
With the advent of academic journals as a new medium for the communication of knowledge in the West in approximately the 17th century, earlier studies mainly focusing on making revised editions and/or attaching annotations were developed into truly modern studies. However, it was the appearance of an academic society formed by groups of professionals in educational organizations such as universities capable of using journals to reproduce knowledge that led to the systematization of studies.

This modernization of studies in the West, having developed from the close relationship between academic journals and academic societies and universities, was professionalized between the late 19th and the early 20th century (1848-1914 CE). Academic study in Europe was divided into three subject areas, i.e. politics, economics and sociology, corresponding to the political, economic and social spheres that were the three areas of human activities producing the enormous benefits in the modern world.
division into history, anthropology and Oriental studies. These divisions of study show the characteristics of the modern academic system called scientific study, which was acknowledged by the Japanese earliest in East Asia as the essence of science in the 19th century during the Meiji period. They named this as gakka, meaning subject, and when they knew that the term 'subject' contains a general meaning, namely 'various studies', they made another new specialized term called kagaku, meaning science, in order to emphasize the meaning of a more specified new study. Science is understood as an individual study or a professional study. In the light of this information we can perceive that the Japanese understood modern science in terms of a system rather than in terms of an original method or a paradigm. This can be proved by the fact that Westernized studies were imported into Japan by the power of the government in pursuit of modernization in order to increase the production and circulation of modern studies.

This 'study as a system' imported from Europe as a model and modified in Japan then spread to other countries in East Asia. In the process other modifications developed according to the conditions prevailing in individual nations and also in relation to the study, but the basic framework continues today without major changes. In my opinion, this explanation cannot completely uncover the whole story of the establishment and the modifications in modern studies. Thus, I argue that an examination is necessary for the production and circulation of studies both from the outside and inside of the modern academic system in East Asia for the purpose of a better understanding. Thus, in order to answer the social question that cannot be completely satisfied only by 'the study as a system', I examine the process of the production and circulation of studies outside the system, which I refer to as 'the study as a movement'.

1 This paper is a Korean translation of the thesis presented under the above title at an international symposium (Taipei: 17th Dec. 2003) on "A model of knowledge and the circulation of knowledge in modern times in China" which was held at the Institute of Modern History, Taiwan Central Research Foundation.

2 Nakayama, 1974. According to a different interpretation, the term 'science' kagaku has the meaning of 'the study of hundred subjects'. This term is found neither in the Chinese classics nor in the Japanese classics but was invented by the Japanese and was transmitted into the other countries in East Asia.

3 The words the study as a movement are not fully conceptualized, but using these terms, I will try to restore the process of the production and circulation of self-generated-knowledge in East Asia, which has been excluded from the system under the influence of systematized study and also depreciated as folk/ethnic knowledge or fragmentary knowledge. The results of this work can be eventually used as cultural resources to exceed the limit of an institutionalized and modernized academic system.

As a case study for a model in the circulation of modern studies in East Asia, and in order to discover how Oriental history, which was a part of the three divisions of history (Western history, Oriental history and national history) formed by the Japanese Imperial University in the system of modern studies and underwent a change which is the cause of the present problem, I will examine the history of academia in Japan and Korea from the viewpoint that the formation of modern studies in East Asia arose from the interdependence and discord between two aspects, i.e. the study as a system and the study as a movement, before making a final comparison with historical studies in China.

**Oriental History Originated by the Japanese Imperial University**

In his book written about the modern history of Japan, Ienaga Saburó argues that after the Meiji Revitalizing Reform two tendencies in Japanese historical studies existed side by side. One is "the attitude of studying history focusing on only practical interest", the other is "the attitude of historical research from either the strict examination of historical materials or the accurate revelation of facts by taking an objective view". The history of civilization based on the former attitude appeared earlier than the latter in modern Japan and was common as an enlightenment movement during the early Meiji period. One of the characteristics of this trend, revealing the process of the development of civilization, is that historical study is regarded as a social science, and the discovery of laws in social science is equivalent to the aims of historical study. This is followed by folk history which appeared in the second and third decade of the Meiji period (1887-1897 CE). Though those who were interested in folk history depended on journalism as a methodology and also showed a strong interest in practical matters, they were not highly skilled at making academic systems and dealing with historical materials. Then followed historical studies based on the materialistic interpretation of history that made rapid progress in the early days of the Shôwa period. This trend could be included in the sphere of the study as a movement. In contrast, the genealogy of 'the study as a system' originating from historical studies in academia was established at the department of history in Tokyo Imperial University that advocated historical studies based on positivism. This was accepted into the mainstream due to the diffusion of modern academic systems such as university.

The historians who founded historical studies as a system in the early days of the Meiji period in Japan realized that this is obviously different from...
the typical organization of describing history in East Asia, that is, 'the study of historiographer's record', and "in fact this could be the result of the divisions of the study following the development of science." In addition, they believed that since historical studies in modern times are significant in contributing to the formation of a nation state, most historians edit and write about national history out of patriotism. This belief is obviously revealed in an article written by Shigeno Yasutsugu, who was leading the department of history of the Imperial University, which was published in the first edition of the Journal of the Society for Historical Studies, just after the Organization of Affairs of Compiling the National History had been transferred from the Cabinet to the Imperial University (1888 CE). Yasutsugu states that this Organization was founded by him together with government officials because of the necessity of organizing an academic society and publishing a journal following discussions with the invited lecturer Riess after transferring from studying historiography to teaching at the Imperial University. In addition, he clarified the purposes of organizing an academic society as giving benefits to the nation by means of analyzing the historical materials collected by government officials, using the methods of researching history in the West, from finding and compiling the historical evidences. In short, differing from Europe, the foundations of the systematization of modern historical studies in Japan were formed simultaneously since the Imperial University, academic society and journal were established under the influence of the government at the same time.

As Riess mentions, the Society for Historical Studies (Nov. 1889 CE) and its Journal were established in Dec. 1889 CE for the purpose of setting a high standard of historical research, making historical studies a pure science and encouraging the public to read historical books, and both played an important role in the formation of modern historical studies. In Japan, the department of history was subordinate to national historical study. In 1889, the department of national history was established for the purpose of education and research of Japanese history, and in 1904 the department of national history taught three main subjects, i.e. National history, Chinese history, and Western history through the reformation of the humanities department in Tokyo Imperial University (the title of Chinese history was changed into Oriental history in 1910). This system was applied to all the other universities, for example, Kyoto Imperial University established a college of humanities in 1906 and a department of history in 1907 (Waseda University and Keio University both established a department of history and taught Oriental history from the fourth decade of the Meiji period). This educational system became the basis for research and education in history and the tradition even for newly established universities after the Pacific War.

This peculiar educational system, i.e., the three divisions of studies, originating in Japan is worthy of scrutiny in order to understand the characteristics of historical studies in Japan. The basis for separating Japanese history from world history and of writing world history to the exclusion of Japanese history already existed at the time of the formation of the three divisions of studies which was the result of understanding history from the biased Japanese point of view. This idea provided the theoretical basis for the establishment of the nation state (the modern Emperor nation) since the Meiji period. As a result, the study of foreign history was subordinate to national historical study.

The same situation occurred in the process of the origins of the study of Oriental history that is the main concern of this paper. The process of the formation of the study of Oriental history which is highly competitive and regarded as a study being originally Japanese is wholly different from those of the other subjects which were imported in their completed form directly from the West. In 1889 when the Sino-Japanese War began, the secondary educational authority argued that the study of foreign history should be divided into Oriental history and Western history, and the study of Oriental history should be given relative importance. Thus, the study of history in high schools was divided into three subjects, and the study of Oriental history was included in the curriculum of middle schools by the Education Ministry. This is the first appearance of the title, i.e., the study of Oriental history in historical education. As already shown above, in the case of the university, the title of the study of Chinese history was changed into the study of Oriental history in 1910. The birth of Oriental history as an individual subject in Japan was basically due to the political situa-

---

7 Shigeno, 1889: 1.
Thus, the study of Oriental history in Japan has been highly developed owing to the possession of abundant historical materials resulting from their close relationship with neighboring countries, and also the introduction of a new methodology based on positive philosophy. However, some scholars maintain that though the prestige of the study of Oriental history in Japan was gained by technical and careful analysis of materials, the historians at the time were not aware of the foundation of Oriental history, and overlooked the unified system and holistic image of Oriental history through a lack of awareness of world history. In addition, because of this fact, they suggested that the study of Oriental history was far beyond the standard of study of Western history, and it created a bad reputation that the Oriental history was boring.19

The Abridgment and Transplantation of the Model of the Imperial University: the Study of Oriental History in the Former Japanese Colony, Joseon

Kyeongseong Imperial University was opened in 1926 as the only university in Korea and the sixth university throughout the whole of Japanese Empire. Its basic system was abridged and transplanted from the typical model of Tokyo Imperial University, and thus, is based on the department of law and literature. Kyeongseong Imperial University was established through the unification of the three departments of Tokyo Imperial University, i.e. the department of literature, law and economics.

Concerning the role of Kyeongseong Imperial University which was an abridged and transplanted form of Tokyo Imperial University, the first director Hattori Unokichi clearly stated in his address at the opening ceremony that the mission of the university was to do research on Korea consulting various academic fields in close association with China and Japan, and to gain authority in the research of Oriental culture.20 Yi Jinho who was present as a Korean guest at the opening ceremony added that the special mission of Kyeongseong Imperial University located in Korea was to do research on the cultural relationship of Korea with Japan and China because of Korea's geographical position, between Japan and China.21

The goal at the opening of Kyeongseong Imperial University, as they both pointed out, was to examine Korean Orientalism as it developed from its cultural relationship with Japan and China. Furthermore, the reason of the existence of Kyeongseong Imperial University was to provide the doctrinal foundation for the colonialization of Korea by means of researching into Korea not as a nation but as a part of the Orient. This is also revealed in the organization of the department of history of Kyeongseong Imperial University. The department of history included the three major subjects: Japanese history, Korean history and Oriental history.22

Most Japanese scholars, in general, believe that the study of Oriental history in Japan has been highly developed owing to the possession of abundant historical materials resulting from their close relationship with neighboring countries, and also the introduction of a new methodology based on positive philosophy. However, some scholars maintain that though the prestige of the study of Oriental history in Japan was gained by technical and careful analysis of materials, the historians at the time were not aware of the foundation of Oriental history, and overlooked the unified system and holistic image of

20 Hirota, 1962.
21 Uehara, 1976:45.
23 Address made by the president of the university, found in Bunkyo no Chosen (1926:3-4).
25 See the prospectus of Kyeongseong Imperial University of 1942 (pp. 74-75). According to
the subject of Western history was replaced by Korean history, this system could be understood essentially in the framework of the three divisions of the department of history of the Imperial University. Though there was a lack of world view and Korean history was created as an independent subject and was studied under the academic category of the study of Oriental history, which means that the department of history of Kyongseong Imperial University recognized the order of ranks between East Asian nations established by Japanese colonialism.

This was not the first time that Korean studies were separated and established as an independent study in order to provide academic work and to disseminate Korean studies systematically. In 1916, it had already started when the Government-General of Korea simultaneously promoted two works. the compilation of Korean history and the investigation of historic remains. As was mentioned in the preface of the first issue entitled ‘A Lecture on Korean History’ (Sep. 1922) published by the Society of Korean History, the purpose was to control and exclude with a strict examination system Korean academic results which were not academically developed and which were still in the traditional form. Thus, the opening of Kyongseong Imperial University was established at the time for the purpose of creating academic strictness, producing professional scholars and systematizing new studies.

Now, it is necessary to examine the study outside the system (especially the academic world of Korean history), which was being controlled and excluded by the supreme academic authority of the Imperial University.

Without tracing back to the scholars’ research on Chinese and Korean historical texts in the early Joseon dynasty period, it is evident that the study of Korean history (the movement for the Korean studies) appeared at the time of the movement of patriotic enlightenment during the period of the Daehan Empire in the late 19th century. The higher educational institutions of the Daehan Empire such as Sungkyunkwan were closed or downgraded, and both Ewha school and Severance medical school lost their college title. In April 1910, the official regulations for a college were promulgated. In December 1910, the Gwangmunhoe, nicknamed a Korean academy, was organized by Choe Namseon, its central figure. The higher educational institutions of the Daehan Empire such as Sungkyunkwan were closed or downgraded, and both Ewha school and Severance medical school lost their college title. The higher educational institutions of the Daehan Empire such as Sungkyunkwan were closed or downgraded, and both Ewha school and Severance medical school lost their college title. In April 1910, the official regulations for a college were promulgated. In December 1910, the Gwangmunhoe, nicknamed a Korean academy, was organized by Choe Namseon, its central figure.

Thus, they tried to exclude an academic world that was expressed in the Korean language, and existed outside the Imperial University by using the Japanese language on the one hand, and by maintaining their academic superiority by means of scientific exactness on the other hand.

Their power of knowledge based on the science seems to have had a strong effect. A representative Korean historian leading the academic move-
ment at that time maintained that research into the study of Korean history should rely on the modern research methods such as scientific method, and added that it is a matter of a scholarly conscience to take pride in the study of Korean history without scientific research and reasonable explanations. This remark that scientific research is not fully developed in Korea reminds us of the above mentioned comments of the Imperial University’s scholars that the study of Korean history is only an enlightened approach not accompanied by scientific exactness. This proves the effect of the control of the Japanese over the Korean academic world.

The intellectual control by the Imperial University spread with the support of professionals who graduated from the Imperial University. From 1929 Korean graduates began to be produced, and as professionals they had pride in their acquisition of scientific exactness by using the Japanese language. A good example of this pride was expressed in the postscript to the first edition of the academic journal called Shin-H eung Sinko where existing studies were criticized for lacking resolute doctrines and scientific foundations. Through this medium of the journal, they argued with conviction that they were educated in scientific systems and were producing genuine academic papers in the Korean language against the exclusion of the academic world as expressed only in the Japanese language. However, they also repeated the same kind of discrimination against the existing research of the Korean people for depending on the authority of Kyeongseong Imperial University representing study as a system.

In this manner, Kyeongseong Imperial University controlled academic activities, and also played a major role in expanding the sphere of academic activities from the 1930s. Jindan hakhoe, an academic society was founded in May 1934 by the graduates of Kyeongseong Imperial University, Japanese universities and private colleges in Korea. An academic journal called Jindan hakbo was published in Korean by Jindan hakhoe emphasizing research into the culture of Korea and its neighboring countries. From June 1934 to June 1941, this academic society dealt with the institutionalized study mainly for Japanese people, and also contributed to improve the general perspective and exactness for research in history by means of the practical research methodology used by the Japanese Society of History.

The sphere of the Jindan hakhoe existed outside Kyeongseong Imperial University, but considering its members’ alma mater and their academic methodology, it was midway between ‘the study as a system’ and ‘the study as a movement’. Due to this point, the present academic study of Korean history has been called a historical view of positivism, which is criticized as the opposite of the historical view of nationalism.

The academic activities based on the historical view of nationalism were popular around the 1930s as a movement in Korean studies, which corresponds to the study as a movement together with a historical view of materialism. They had a strong influence in areas of the press and publishing. Their knowledge of the study of Korean history was highly developed, and laid the foundation for Korean studies at the present time. Regarding Chinese studies, they also wrote many articles and essays on Chinese current affairs in those days, which became a valuable resource for the research of modern Chinese history. This kinds of research contracts sharply with research on the basis of imperialism made by the members of ‘Manmong munwha yeon’guhoe’ in Kyeongseong Imperial University, which was organized in 1931 and renamed as ‘Daeryuk munwha yeon’guhoe’ in 1938, simultaneously with the Japanese advance into the Chinese mainland.

Though this study as a movement was published in academic journals which played a role as a communication for a new paradigm called scientific study, and was supported by the community of professionals called academic society, it unfortunately was not developed and systematized because it did not take any position in the university and could not reproduce knowledge. As a matter of fact, there also existed the educational organizations that emphasized anti-governmental study and nationalism, such as Yeonhui College opened by the Christians in 1917. This college divided history into three subjects, i.e. national history, here meaning Japanese history, Oriental history and Western history, with Western history as an independent subject given priority, while Korean history was also taught in the class of Oriental history, differing from Kyeongseong Imperial University. This college, however, basically relied on the Japanese educational division system and the above three subjects for the study of history was not developed enough into three departments to produce independent historians. In addition, around the 1940s private colleges were placed under requisition by the Government-General of Korea, and the Korean language was prohibited and Korean magazines were discontinued by force.

23 Choe Namsun .2410.
24 Sinhaung (1929). First Issue. Epilogue
with the result that the activities of academic societies and their journals were stopped. In conclusion, the study as a system in Kyungsing Imperial University continued to exist and work for the political purposes of the Japanese.

The Scientific and Systematic Approach to the Study of Chinese History

In this section, I will deal with the conditions for the study of history in modern period of China, while considering the relationship between the three divisions of historical studies as originated by the Japanese.

From 1902, the modern educational system of the Qing dynasty adopted the three divisions of historical studies, i.e. Chinese history, Asian history and Western history. The application can be found in national textbooks used at that time. However, in those textbooks Japanese history was mainly emphasized rather than the other countries in Asia, and the process of colonization of Asian countries was described in detail. This tradition was continued even after the formation of the government of the Republic of China. During the period of the capital of Nanjing, they unified Eastern history and Western history as foreign history and turned the three divisions of historical textbooks into two divisions, and even tried to unify Chinese history and foreign history. However, this trend can be only found in historical textbooks, for we cannot find any proof of the strong influence of either the three divisions or Oriental history as an independent subject in the systematized process of historical studies.

The modern Chinese study of history begins from the ‘revolution of the academic world of history’ mentioned by Liang Qichao. The essential point of his doctrine is that the study of history is necessary to build a nation state, and a revolution in the study of history should be made in order to save China. Thus, he believed that the purpose of the study of modern history was to reconstruct the past as the time of the nation state, i.e. the national history. Though some scholars argue that the study of modern history in such early times cannot be evaluated as real academic study, I think that apart from the study of history using scientific and systematic methodology, which was a typical model of the academic group relying on historical materials from 1920, this doctrine also can be regarded as a new study of history in that it represents the scientific style of studying history to justify the nation state. This can correspond to the study as a movement as I defined it.

The New Cultural Movement occurring on May the fourth 1919 provided the new essentials for the scientific approach to the study of history. Since the republican political system which could have had been realized as a result of Xinhai Geming was abandoned in the early period of the Republic of China, while stressing the importance of their spirit or principles rather than the systems of Western civilizations, Chinese intellectuals were developing a new cultural movement and tried to join in the trend of world academia by means of using the scientific approach and methodology. The most significant point for the study of history at that time is to emphasize method and methodology for the contemporary study of Chinese history, for it is from then that the focus for the study of history turns toward methodology, i.e. “how do we study the history?”

The Guogu zheqeng yundong is known for its significant role in the foundation of the scientific study of history. The shihlaoxue pai became the symbol of scientific method for introducing the methodology of the natural sciences into the mainstream of the academic study of history under the direct influence of the international study of the Chinese classics and at the request of the Chinese academic community.

As shown above, the scientific approach to the study of history is apparently different from the Liang Qi Chao’s understanding of science as the scientific interpretation of historical development is that the former is based on the principles of a professionalized science which tries to attain objective knowledge through methodologically controlled research.

However, the enthusiasm for the study of national classics in fact began to ebb away at the time of the completion of an expedition to conquer the north. In order to develop the study of national classics from 1922, nationwide organizations such as Zhongguo xueshutuanti xiehui (1927 CE) and Zhongguo...
yanjiuyuan (1928 CE) were formed on the basis of the results that the research organizations had established in the major universities such as Beijing University. However, though the professional researchers were trained and the academic journals were published, in the end they were not successful. In terms of the cause of failure, it can be argued that in spite of using the scientific methods the study of national classics failed to provide the academic standard. However, it is more accurate to argue that in those days it was impossible to institutionalize the study of national classics for modern study in the academic systems rather than the failure of scientific methods. After national unification following the completion of an expedition to conquer the north, the Nanjing republican government began to make a standard form for organizations' regulations and curricula for each school under a general rule to standardize the educational system. Thus, the republican government promulgated a law for the university system in 1929, where there was no provision for the study of national classics.

This raises the question of the significance of the department for the study of history as an independent study, which when institutionalized by the university was another way of making the new study of history scientific. It originated from the foundation of the department of study of history in Beijing University. Thus, a basic model proposed was suggested for the study of history as a system.

In the 1910s the study of history was established as a major subject in relation to an organization compiling a national history. When this organization was assigned to Beijing University (1917 CE), because of its conservative disposition, it was exceptionally positioned in the college of humanities to be influenced by the New Cultural Movement. Thus, in the 1910s the study of history was not more popular with students than Chinese and foreign literatures. Even ordinary people still regarded the study of history as a part of the study of national classics. Later when a new opportunity came, Zhu Xizu, the director of the department for the study of history, reformed his department on the basis of the study of national classics.

In comparison there was a different view among historical scholars of Dongnan University in Nanjing. Though they basically agreed with the application of scientific methods to the study of history, they supported humanism against the current opinion of adopting the scientific approach for the study of history because they believed that the study of history has scientific and unscientific characteristics. At any rate, from the 1930s the scientific approach to the study of history continued after the May the Fourth Movement introduced standardization and systematization. The characteristics of the three subjects under the department of history, i.e., time, space and events gradually influenced the basic curricula of the department for the study of history of the other universities. Thus, general history and the division of history into periods, national history and the history of boundaries, and professional history and history under special titles, were three groups of subjects used as the standard of teaching students of a new generation by the department of history of the other universities from 1930, and became an important reference for the Ministry of Education at the time of making the list of compulsory and optional courses of the department of history. Besides, in 1940 the academic consultation council that was officially organized in the Ministry of Education became the national supreme academic consultation organization and a teacher's license examination legislated by the Ministry of Education was established as the standard of objective evaluation for the qualification of professorship. In short, the standard for the specialized certification of historians and the basis for the academic evaluation were stabilized between the 1930s and the 1940s.

The standardization and specialization of the study of history generally developed together with the settlement of an academic system and the formation of an academic community which were produced as a result of the proper function of a university, a research center and an academic journal. In China the
academic system for the regulations of academic activities was stabilized between the 1930s and the 1940s. Basically a scholar should not write an article on any popular publication, newspaper or cultural publication, but should write a paper in accordance with the standard and aim of the academic journal in order to publish the results of his research in the journal for the academic community. Thus, the academic research could be independent of society because the researchers did not need to be conscious of general readers or to consider contemporary values. Though this could be understood as being excluded from society, it was a major step forward for the academic community.

This process of standardization was not only a result of academic development about the study of history between the 1930s and the 1940s, but also of the reinforcement of control over academic education as a means of centralized authoritarian rule by the Nanjing Government. The autonomy of universities and the freedom of studies were attained between the 1930s and the 1940s because of the weakness of the power of central government, and in the 1930s the academic freedom was limited in education for the political party. As people believed that the lack of academic standards and the absence of accurate curricula and the frequent participation in political affairs were the main causes of the ruin of educational since the 1920s, it is a fact that the European universities' system having more centralization and standardization was preferred by the Nanjing Government. In this case, it may not be appropriate to mention that the standardization and specialization of the study of history were completed in a paradoxical situation. Nevertheless, it is beyond doubt that the framework for the study as a system was put in place, i.e. the disciplined study by well educated professional historians on the basis of an objective and positive foundation with the aim of specialization.

Conclusion

As we have already seen above, the three divisions for the study of history which reflect the Japanese systematization of history in the early 20th century more or less influenced the production and process of knowledge about regional history of East Asia. Though Chinese people were relatively little influenced, they did not invent any original intellectual organization or system about regional history except their own history. They neglected research into the history of their neighboring countries (the limits included in the history of East Asia), and concentrated their research on individual history instead. Within the modern history of East Asia, there exists a difference like this, but there is also a common point that there are two sides, i.e. the study as a system and the study as a movement. In order to understand this situation, I would emphasize the colonization involved on the side of the system of the humane science and sociology including the modern history of East Asia. Since the study of history has appeared as a major subject (together with politics, economics, sociology, Oriental studies and anthropology) in the 19th century in the West, which explores the past of Europe as the center of the development of the modern world, various research methods have been developing. In comparison with their study of history, in East Asia where modernization was enforced they accepted the scientific approach for the study of history within limits and separately and in the process of the establishment of the modern study of history depending on external authority, they tended to insist on the scientific approach as a universal doctrine according to their own ideological and political situations. Since the study of history had no proper language to answer the questions of the history of East Asia, it was difficult to escape intellectual colonization and consequently the separation between knowledge and life. Thus, it was natural that the study of history could not connect with the reality of East Asia.

Now, it is necessary to reconstruct the same principles for the study of history of East Asia. Wang Fansen argues that the study of modern Chinese history experienced a revolution three times, and I believe that the study of modern history of East Asia needs another revolution. In this case, the central topic of discussion should not be “How do we study the history?” but “Why do we study the history?” In the end, the spirit of the study of history of East Asia in the 20th century will arise from the challenge to the nature of the study of history (far more the system of the study). I think that there are ways of opening history locked in the objects of the study of history, i.e. the study as a system, and of uniting knowledge with life firmly. This is the most opportune time for visualizing a new study crossing inside and outside the system when raising the issue of reforms of the university system.
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