

16

Training Historians and Ethnologists in Taiwan, 1928–1949

Wei-Chi Chen, Wan-yao Chou, and Ku-ming (Kevin) Chang

Introduction

The first university in Taiwan was founded in 1928 by the Japanese colonial rulers in Taipei as Taihoku Imperial University (台北帝國大學, hereafter Taihoku). Literally, the name meant the Japanese empire's university in Taipei, though the city's name was pronounced and transliterated in Japanese as Taihoku. As the first institution of higher education in Taiwan, Taihoku not only provided teaching but also generously supported academic research. Especially relevant to this volume, it also institutionalized research education for its students.

Scientific or academic research had been done in Taiwan before the founding of Taihoku. TORII Ryūzō (鳥居龍藏, 1870–1953) and INŌ Kanori (伊能嘉矩, 1867–1925) did ethnographical studies of Taiwanese aboriginals in the 1890s and 1900s. Neither of them had a university education. Torii taught himself anthropology after he had dropped out of elementary school. His knowledge won him a position as the curator of anthropological specimens at Tokyo Imperial University. He then served as the university's commissioned fieldworker from 1896 to 1900 to explore several territories on the margins of the Japanese empire, including Taiwan, then a newly acquired colony.¹ Inō went to a teacher's school and worked as a news editor first. His interest in anthropology led him to join the Tokyo Anthropological Society, of which Torii was also a member. Inō was recruited by the Governor-General's Office of Taiwan from 1895 to 1906 to investigate aboriginals on the island and then conducted cultural and

¹ Torii Ryūzō Torii, *Tanxian Taiwan: Niaoju Longzang de renleixue zhilu* (Exploring Taiwan: Torii Ryūzō's journey to the anthropology of Taiwan), trans. Nan-chun Yang (Taipei City, 1986), 426–7.

historical surveys for the governance of the new colony.² Though neither man received a university education and Inō never held a university position, their publications from the 1890s to the 1920s have been hailed as monuments in the history and anthropology of Taiwan.

A generation later, things changed considerably. The previous generation of Japanese scholars could still achieve fame in history and anthropology without an academic position, and even without university education. In the interwar period and later, accomplished historians and anthropologists in Japan and its colonies were based in academia. They received a foundational education for academic research at the university; some even pursued advanced study abroad and doctorates. These are all signs of the professionalization of academic scholars and the institutionalization of research education—even though the junior scholars never stopped informal research training, either on their jobs at the university or by themselves outside it.

This chapter investigates the education for academic research that took shape in colonial Taiwan and the informal training that was available to junior scholars. It first briefly introduces the context of the founding of the only university in the colony in 1928, then examines the teaching of the two fields of Southeast Asian history and ethnology, in which the colonial government of Taiwan invested heavily, and draws a pattern from the careers of the faculty. This is followed by an analysis of the four modes of research training available at the time, and a description of the foundational education available to the first generation of Taiwanese academics in ethnology in a few years after Japan's handover of Taiwan to China. The findings of this survey are of great significance for the history of science and the humanities in Taiwan and to a large extent applicable to the history of research education in the humanities and social sciences in Japanese universities during the interwar decades.

The Foundation and Organization of Taihoku Imperial University

The idea of establishing a university in the colony of Taiwan had been discussed for several years in Taiwan and Japan before it was proposed to the cabinet of the empire.³ The arguments for its establishment, as presented in the proposal, can be summarized in three points. The first

² Wei-Chi Chen, *Yineng Jiaju: Taiwan lishi minzuzhi de zhankai* (Inō Kanori and the emergence of historical ethnography of Taiwan) (Taipei City, 2014), 17–26.

³ Suying Ou, *Chuangcheng yu chuangxin: zhanhou chuqi Taiwan Daxue de zaichufa, 1945–1950* (Continuation and innovation: the relaunch of Taiwan University in the early postwar period, 1945–1950), 2nd ed. (Taipei City, 2012), 12–17.

justified the selection of Taiwan for a new imperial university. The colony of Taiwan, located at the southern end of the Japanese Empire and between continental China and Southeast Asian islands, occupied a strategic position that could facilitate the spread of Japanese civilization to the south (which in general meant Southeast Asia from Thailand to Indonesia), aid the empire's advance into East Asia (which generally meant China and Korea), and contribute to the world's civilization. The second argument concerned the practical value of the university. Taiwan was an excellent stepping-stone for Japanese nationals to advance south. A research university that produced studies of southern civilizations would prepare the necessary knowledge for southbound advances. The university would host students from southern China and Southeast Asia, give them facilities for study and research, show them the true value of the Japanese civilization, induce mutual understanding between nations, and open new opportunities for East Asian civilizations.⁴ These two arguments also led to the university's heavy investment in Southeast Asian history and the ethnology of Taiwan.

The third argument concerned the educational needs of the residents in Taiwan. The university was mainly to serve children of ethnic Japanese. It was hoped that they, a valuable source for replenishing manpower, would stay in Taiwan for higher education and then take up the responsibility of invigorating the colony. The islanders (the local Taiwanese) also had an educational need. Up to that point, most Taiwanese students had been attending private universities in Japan's homeland. They were able to see the dark side of the country. They then returned home influenced by improper (that is, seditious) thought, creating obstacles to the governance of the colony. If they went to China for university education, they were infected by the increasing anti-Japanese sentiment and communism. A university in Taiwan would spread healthy thought, impart proper knowledge, and open a path to study that was in the firm control of the colonial authority.⁵

There were four organizational units—faculty, chair, department, and major—in the imperial universities in Japan, including the one in Taiwan. A university consisted of several faculties (學部 *gakubu*). The first and foremost imperial university, Tokyo Imperial University, had seven (letters, sciences, law, medicine, engineering, agriculture, and economics) in the interwar period. The new imperial university in Taiwan opened with two,

⁴ Chou Wan-yao, 'Taibei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo, zhuangong jiqi zhanhou yixu, 1928–1960' (Nanyō-shih as a chair and as a major at Taihoku Imperial University and its postwar development, 1928–1960), *Taida lishi xuebao* (Historical Inquiry of the Department of History, National Taiwan University), 61 (2018), 28–9.

⁵ Chou, 'Taibei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 29–30.

the Faculty of Letters and ‘State Sciences’ (after the German term *Staatswissenschaften*, which included law, political, and economic sciences that served the governance of the state) and the Faculty of Physical and Agricultural Sciences. A chair was essentially a unit for research. In the Faculty of Letters and State Sciences there were twenty chairs in, for example, national language and literature, Western literature, national history (that is, Japanese history), East Asian history (東洋史), Southeast Asian history (南洋史), and ethnology (土俗人種學).⁶ A complete chair came with positions for a professor (the chair occupant), an assistant professor, a lecturer, an assistant (especially for laboratory sciences), and sometimes a teaching assistant, although few chairs were equipped with a complete staff. The chair had at its disposal a library, and, in the case of the chair of ethnology, a specimen room, a laboratory, a darkroom, and an exhibit room (sometimes known as a museum) in addition. Thus a chair in its entirety was a small research institute. Indeed, the professor of ethnology identified to his international colleagues the complete organization of his chair as the Institute of Ethnology,⁷ which will be followed in the discussion below. An institute did not correspond to a department (學科, *gakka*), which was essentially a unit for teaching at the university. There were only four departments in the Faculty of Letters and State Sciences: philosophy, history, literature, and state sciences. Each offered a few majors or concentrations (專攻). The history department, for example, offered majors in national history (Japanese history), East Asian history (mainly Chinese history), and Southeast Asian history. Thus Southeast Asian history was both a major and an institute. In contrast, ethnology, though claiming a chair, was not a major, admitting no undergraduate students. The institute was responsible for one course in ethnology that was required for all three majors in the Department of History. In this sense, and only in this sense, was the Institute of Ethnology a part of the history department.

Academic Careers at Japanese Universities

The careers of the teaching staff of the Institutes of Southeast Asian History and of Ethnology give a good idea of the formation of junior scholars in

⁶ There are no exact equivalents of 東洋, 南洋, and 土俗人種 in English. Since the first two terms for the most part meant East Asia (especially China) and Southeast Asia, they are translated as such in this chapter for the sake of simplicity. The last could mean folklore, ethnology, and anthropology. It is translated as ‘ethnology’, as the founding president of Taihoku Imperial University understood it. For his understanding, see Nobuhito Miyamoto, *Wo de Taiwan jixing* (Recollections of my time in Taiwan), trans. Wen-hsun Sung and Chao-mei Lien (Taipei City, 1998), 48.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 48.

colonial Taiwan, and by extension across Japan. The professor, that is, the chairholder, in Southeast Asian history was MURAKAMI Naojiro (村上直次郎, 1868–1966). He had an assistant professor, IWAO Seiichi (岩生成一, 1900–1988), and an assistant, YANAI Kenji (箭内健次, 1910–?). The chair of ethnology was UTSURIKAWA Nenzō (移川子之藏, 1884–1947). He had an assistant, MIYAMOTO Nobuhito (宮本延人, 1901–1987), and a commissioned fieldworker, Mabuchi Tōichi (馬淵東一, 1909–1988), a history graduate of Taihoku who was later promoted to assistant professor.

Murakami was already a senior scholar when he was recruited by the university in Taipei. He studied history at Tokyo from 1892 to 1895 and was admitted to graduate school (大學院) immediately thereafter. Leaving graduate school without an advanced degree, Murakami then studied Southeast Asian languages and historical geography in Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands for three years on a government scholarship. He returned to Japan in 1902 to take up a senior position (as a professor) at Tokyo Foreign Language School, and was later co-appointed as a lecturer at Tokyo Imperial University. He became the president of the Tokyo Foreign Language School in 1908 and continued his co-appointment at Tokyo. He was awarded the Doctor of Letters degree in 1921 for his work on Japan-Mexico trade in the seventeenth century.⁸ From the 1890s to the 1920s Murakami was three times commissioned by Japan's Ministry of Colonies or Taiwan's Governor-General's Office to collect documents on Taiwan (written in Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, or even a transliterated indigenous language) or to cowrite a history of Taiwan. With his accomplishments he seemed a perfect candidate for the chair of Southeast Asian history at the new university in Taipei, the first in the empire. With the university's support he again went on a tour of advanced study to the Netherlands, Britain, Spain, Portugal, and Java before his arrival in Taiwan in 1929.

Professor of Ethnology Utsurikawa had a somewhat unusual career for a Japanese academic. He was not a graduate of one of the best imperial universities, such as Tokyo or Kyoto. He finished high school, university (at Chicago), and doctoral education (at Harvard) all in the United States. He received his PhD in anthropology in 1917 with a dissertation on Indonesian art.⁹ An outsider to Japanese academia, he at first could only find a job as an English teacher at Keio University, a leading private institution.

⁸ Pi-Ling Yeh, 'Cunshang Zhicilang de Taiwan shi yanjiu' (Murakami Naojiro's study of Taiwan history), *Guoshiguan xueshu jikan* (The Journal of Academia Historica) 17 (2008), 8–9.

⁹ The title of Utsurikawa's dissertation is 'Some Aspects of the Decorative Art of Indonesia: A Study in Ethnographic Relations' His supervisors included Roland Dixon and

He then became a professor at Tokyo Commerce School, and then a professor at Taipei Senior High School (which was essentially the preparatory program for university students). Appointed as the chair of ethnology at Taihoku, he, like the other appointees, was given an overseas-study scholarship. He first secured in Japan the abovementioned Inō's *Nachlasse* for his library, then spent close to two years in Europe before assuming his position at the university in 1928.

The junior scholars under the chair of Southeast Asian history, Iwao and Yanai, both received their academic positions shortly after finishing their BA. Iwao graduated from the Department of National History at Tokyo in 1925. He was then appointed compiler of historical materials at Tokyo, collecting and editing historical materials in European languages. He developed a specialty in studies of Japanese communities in Southeast Asia, using in particular materials in Dutch and Spanish. He was appointed assistant professor at Taihoku in 1929 under Murakami. In 1930–1932 he took a tour of advanced study to the Netherlands, Britain, the Dutch Indies, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. He succeeded Murakami as professor of Southeast Asian history upon the latter's resignation (for health reasons) in 1935.¹⁰ Iwao was awarded the Doctor of Letters in 1951, after his departure from Taiwan. Yanai was also a history graduate of Tokyo, receiving his BA in 1935 with a thesis on Japan-Spain relations in the early modern period. He was first admitted to the graduate school at Tokyo, then appointed as a lecturer in Southeast Asian history at Taipei in 1936, shortly after Iwao's promotion to professor. Yanai was promoted to assistant professor in 1938.

The junior scholars in the Institute of Ethnology followed a similar pattern. Miyamoto was a history graduate (1928) of Keio, where he took courses and did fieldwork with Utsurikawa, a lecturer there. Aware of his new appointment at Taihoku, Utsurikawa invited Miyamoto to be his assistant there. Miyamoto was promoted to lecturer in 1940 and to assistant professor in 1943. He stayed in Taipei after World War II and became associate and then full professor. Mabuchi was in Utsurikawa's first class at Taihoku. A history major, he took part in anthropological fieldwork every summer. After his graduation in 1931, Utsurikawa commissioned him to do fieldwork for his island-wide aboriginal survey. From 1935 to 1943, Mabuchi worked for Japan's Imperial Academy of Sciences as a commissioned editor on aboriginal customary laws, and then for the East Asian Economic Investigation Bureau of the South Manchurian

Earnest Hooton. David L. Browman and Stephen Williams, *Anthropology at Harvard: A Biographical History, 1790–1940* (Cambridge, MA, 2013), 353–4.

¹⁰ Yeh, 'Cunshang Zhicilang', 105–6.

Railroad Company, which, like the British East India Company in the previous century, employed scholars to do scientific surveys and investigations of Japan's colonial interests in Manchu, Korea, Taiwan, and elsewhere.¹¹ Continuing to publish on Taiwan's aborigines in the best anthropological journals in Japan, Mabuchi was appointed assistant professor at Taihoku in 1943.

Their careers are summarized in Table 1.

This survey, expandable to the teaching staff in national history and East Asian history for a similar result, is sufficient to show the career path for academic humanists and anthropologists at Taipei (and in other imperial universities in general). This pattern, very different from those in other countries, can be summarized with a number of features.

Table 16.1 Careers of the teaching staff in East Asian History and Ethnology at Taihoku, 1928–1945

	Murakami	Utsurikawa	Iwao	Yani	Miyamoto	Mabuchi
Career	BA, Tokyo	PhD, Chicago	BA, Tokyo	BA, Tokyo	BA, Keio	BA, Taihoku
	Grad. Sch. SUT	SUT	NTUP	Grad. Sch.		NTUP
	Lecturer DLitt 1921		Ass. Prof.	Lecturer Ass. Prof.	Assistant Lecturer Gov. Pos.	NUR
	Stud. Abr. Prof. 1929	Stud. Abr. Prof. 1928	Stud. Abr. Prof. 1935 DLitt 1951		Ass. Prof.	Ass. Prof.

Keys to Table 16.1:

Grad. Sch.: Graduate School

D.Litt: Doctor of Letters, followed by the date of receipt

Stud. Abr.: Advanced study abroad

SUT: Sub-university teaching at institutions such as foreign language schools, high schools, teachers' colleges, and commerce schools

NTPU.: Non-teaching positions at the university

Ass. Prof.: Assistant Professor

Gov. Pos.: Government positions, such as Miyamoto's position in the colonial government of Taiwan on affairs of local religion

NUR: Non-university research position

¹¹ For the East Asian Economic Investigation Bureau of the South Manchurian Railroad Company, see, for example, Ito Takeo and Joshua A. Fogel, *Life Along the South Manchurian Railroad* (London, 2016).

1. Undergraduate education was the last formal education a scholar was able to receive.
2. Study in graduate school, though available, was not required for an academic career. A new university graduate might be appointed as an assistant (or teaching assistant, or lecturer) at the university without spending any time in graduate school. In fact, graduate school often provided no formal training. A graduate student did whatever the supervisor asked him to do, which might be collecting and deciphering primary material, wide reading of literature, writing, or participation in a seminar that the supervisor led. The attraction of graduate school was the included scholarship, which enabled a student to dedicate himself to study without being distracted by material needs.¹²
3. The doctorate was not a requirement for a professorship, and even less for any academic rank below it, although it gave candidates for professorial chairs a strong advantage.¹³ Although in principle a graduate student could apply for a doctoral degree with a thesis after two years in graduate school, few humanists bothered. A doctorate thus granted was known as *katei hakushi* (課程博士, program doctorate). This was quite well received by natural scientists and physicians, who often relied on university facilities such as a laboratory for dissertation research. The humanists preferred the other kind of doctorate, known as *ronbun hakushi* (論文博士, thesis doctorate). For this degree, which was very selective, the applicant submitted as his thesis a magnum opus that represented perhaps two or three decades of scholarship. This degree, granted usually quite late in a scholar's career, carried great prestige and real weight for the humanists, whereas the program doctorate meant very little to them.¹⁴

¹² Kozo Iwata, *Kindai Nihon no daigaku kyōjushoku: akademikku purofession no kyaria keisei* (The academic profession in modern Japan: the career path of the professoriate) (Machida-shi, 2011), 109–20.

¹³ In the interwar period, the great majority of the professors in the humanities at the best imperial universities, Tokyo and Kyoto, received the Doctor of Letters degree before their promotion to professor. They usually earned the doctorate in their position as assistant professor, and sometimes before then. This did not apply to the other imperial universities, let alone private universities. *Ibid.*, 93–107. For the university in Taiwan, the colonial government was very serious about its professorial appointments, selecting senior scholars who had established themselves in the field and had received the Doctor of Letters or the PhD degree. Murakami, Utsurikawa, and the Chair of East Asian History, FUJITA Toyohachi, are examples. After the university's opening, however, promotions, not as selective as at Tokyo and Kyoto, required no doctorate.

¹⁴ William K. Cummings, *The Changing Academic Marketplace and University Reform in Japan* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), 198–9.

4. An overseas tour to Europe for advanced study and to relevant countries for research, fieldwork, or primary materials was a regular part of the formation of a scholar for a chair-professorship before World War II. Japan's Ministry of Education and individual universities regularly provided scholarships for study abroad. The colonial government of Taiwan reserved a special fund for all of Taihoku's professor appointees, available even before the opening of the university.¹⁵
5. Since graduate school and the doctorate were not required for an academic career and offered no formal training, the junior scholars in the university basically learned to do advanced research on the job, essentially by watching their seniors. They may be seen as apprentices in this sense.
6. At Taihoku and elsewhere, when a professor left a position open, his assistant professor usually succeeded him. And those under him were promoted through the ranks in sequence. Promotions therefore favored in-house candidates. There were cases (see one below), however, in which a junior scholar lost the competition for promotion and then left the university.
7. As will be seen below, junior scholars might begin teaching at a high school, occupational school, teacher's college, or other non-university educational institution. Sometime during their career, some worked at research institutions, such as the Investigation Bureau of the South Manchurian Railroad Company.¹⁶ Others might be employed by the colonial government for the investigation of local customs, culture, or religions.
8. Publication was crucial for career advancement. This applied to in-house promotions but was even more important for new appointments in universities. For those who followed non-university tracks, accumulation of impressive publications was the key to their return to academia.¹⁷

Research Training

Research training at Japanese universities in this period existed in four modes: undergraduate education, which constituted the only formal academic training; apprenticeship at the university; self-training outside

¹⁵ Chou, 'Taibei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 27–8.

¹⁶ Takeo and Fogel, *Life Along the South Manchurian Railroad*.

¹⁷ An academic career in interwar Japan was of course more complicated than the brief review here. For an broad and in-depth study, see Iwata, *Kindai Nihon no daigaku kyōjushoku*.

the university; and advanced study abroad. The survey below examines these modes of training for scholars and students in Southeast Asian history and ethnology at Taihoku University.

Though today we usually associate graduate education with research training, elements of research were prominent in undergraduate education at Taihoku—in its insistence on the learning of multiple foreign languages, on primary research, and on the preparation of a thesis, based on primary and secondary research, for the BA degree. This is not to suggest that all university graduates moved on to an academic career, however.

The language requirement for the Southeast Asian history major was demanding. Students were expected to have studied English and German in high school. The Faculty of Letters and State Sciences required all entering students to have had two years of French. The major in South Asian history, in addition, required Spanish and Dutch. As students were anticipated to use Spanish in their second year, Professor of Southeast Asian History Murakami taught them Spanish on lunch breaks during their first year. They then began Dutch in the second year.¹⁸ An education that required so many foreign languages was more than just general education.

These languages were needed for primary readings. Every student was required to take a primary reading course for Southeast Asian history and the associated exercise course (which in German universities would be called *Übungen*, exercises, as described in the chapter by Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen). At every meeting a student was chosen to read and translate assigned material in Dutch or Spanish. The material was handed out four or five days before the meeting, and the person in charge often stayed up all night before the meeting to prepare for his presentation. The material, usually six or seven pages long, took two hours to discuss. It was therefore close reading of primary material.¹⁹ This trained students for primary research.

Every student in the major was required to prepare a research paper as their BA thesis. From 1933 to 1943, fifteen theses in Southeast Asian history were submitted. Each worked on various dimensions (trade, missionary, Japanese communities, foreign powers, etc.) of the history of the Philippines or the Dutch Indies. They were written in Japanese, each about 100,000 Japanese characters long (perhaps comparable to English of equal length). Most of the foreign-language references consulted were in English. Some of the theses in addition consulted Spanish and Chinese

¹⁸ Chou, 'Taipei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 20.

¹⁹ Pi-Ling Yeh, 'Taipei diguodaxue yu Jingcheng diguodaxue shixueke zhi bijiao, 1926–1945' (The history departments at Taihoku Imperial University and Keijo Imperial University, a comparison, 1926–1945), *Taiwan shi yanjiu* (Taiwan historical research), 16/3 (2009), 97, 119–20.

literature.²⁰ It might be fair to say that, although such theses might not qualify one for a faculty position today, their quality would exceed the requirement for a college honor thesis and might be even equal to, if not greater than, that for an MA thesis. This showed the seriousness of undergraduate research training at Taihoku.

Students also learned to present their theses in something comparable to the research seminar. The exercise course discussed above does not seem to have required presentations of research papers. The history department, however, organized seminars (讀書會, literally meetings of study) in which students were required to participate. At each meeting a member of the teaching staff and or a student presented a research paper and received critiques from the participants and the presiding professor. Drafts of the BA theses especially were presented in the seminar.²¹ Through their observation and personal participation, students learned the norms, etiquette, and skills for academic writing and presentation.

As can be seen from the number of submitted theses, majors in history were few. Though the Southeast Asian history major was already the most popular of the three in the history department, it only had fifteen graduates by the end of World War II. During this period the Department of History had thirty-three graduates in total, among whom only two were Taiwanese.²² At the time many more Taiwanese students still chose to pursue higher education in Japan, either for the prestige of Japanese institutions or for the relative ease of admission.

Informal training or apprenticeship on the job included study in graduate school and work in junior positions in the university. Graduate study qualified as training on the job, for the student received no formal training. He simply learned to do research on his supervisor's assignment. Sometimes even assistant professors felt that they were receiving training like students, by the side of chair professors. Assistant Professor of Southeast Asian History Iwao, for example, recalled that he felt as if he were also a student when he joined the students for Professor Murakami's lunch-break language study sessions—which he always did.²³ That also means that he learned Murakami's teaching method and style by watching them in person.

What happened to Utsurikawa's assistant and student serves as a good example of apprenticeship. Starting in 1930, Utsurikawa took Miyamoto and his student (and later commissioned fieldworker) Mabuchi with him

²⁰ Chou, 'Taipei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 43–5.

²¹ Ou, *Chuancheng yu chuangxin*, 223.

²² Chou, 'Taipei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 41–3.

²³ Yeh, 'Taipei Diguodaxue yu Jingcheng diguodaxue shixueke zhi bijiao, 1926–1945', 97.

to do three years of fieldwork on the aboriginal peoples across Taiwan and two years of organization and editing of the material for publication. The end result was the two-volume *Formosan Native Tribes: A Genealogical and Classificatory Study* (臺灣高砂族系統所屬の研究, 1935). Without graduate study, the two junior scholars first followed the professor to the field, observed him selecting fields and informants, and watched him interviewing them. Then gradually they took over part of the fieldwork. They also followed the professor's example of transcribing oral history and photographing and even filming figures and rituals in the field. At the end Mabuchi spent 425 days in the field, Miyamoto 129 days, and Utsurikawa 88 days.²⁴ Meanwhile Utsutikawa also embarked on archeological excavations across Taiwan, with Miyamoto in his company. For archeological work, they often worked with the professor of anatomy at Taihoku, KANASEKI Takeo (金關丈夫, 1897–1983). Utsurikawa also directed Miyamoto to study the religions of the Taiwanese population.²⁵ The chair of ethnology thus trained its staff in the ethnology of aboriginals, archaeology, and anthropology of contemporary culture.

The Institute of Ethnology had other resources at its disposal for the training of junior scholars. Its library was equipped with updated international journals, books acquired from Japan, China, Europe, and the United States, and archival materials that had been collected by Inō. As stated above, it also had a specimen room, a darkroom, a laboratory, and an exhibit space. All these were accessible to, and in fact operated by, Utsutikawa's staff. The institute also had its seminar. Compared with the history seminar, the Seminar on the Ethnology of the South (南方土俗) gathered a much wider community that included scholars from the university's Faculty of Letters and State Sciences, Faculty of Physical and Agricultural Sciences, and Faculty of Medicine (which was added to the university in 1936); academically minded officials in Taiwan's colonial government; and teachers from various educational institutions in Taipei and surrounding areas. They met regularly, and presented works and heard presentations on the anthropology of local culture, ethnology of aboriginals, and archaeology. They also established the journal *Nanpo Dozoku* (literally Ethnology of the South; the founders gave it the English title *Ethnology of Southeast Asia and Oceania*) (南方土俗) in 1940.²⁶ The junior scholars of the chair participated in all these activities, and continued to publish with the professor or in their own names.

²⁴ Katsumi Nakao, "Taihoku teikoku daigaku dozoku-jinruigaku kenkyushitsu no kenkyu katsudo (Research activities of the Institute of Ethnology at Taihoku Imperial University)", *Teikoku to koto kyoiku: Higashijia no bunmyaku kara* (Empire and higher education in East Asia), 42 (March 29, 2013), 117.

²⁵ Miyamoto, *Wo de Taiwan jixing*, 184–90.

²⁶ Ou, *Chuancheng yu chuangxin*, 223.

The last mode of research education was self-training. A good example is KOKUBU Naoichi (國分直一, 1908–2005), a Japanese who grew up in Taiwan. He finished high school in Taiwan and then studied as a national history major at Kyoto Imperial University. Thereafter he returned to Taiwan and taught at Tainan Girls' High School (1933–43) and was appointed professor at Taipei Teacher's College in 1943. He stayed in Taiwan after China's takeover as a retained scholar, and became associate professor in the ethnology program at the reorganized university in 1947. He left for Japan when the scholar retention policy was terminated in 1949.

A history major at Kyoto, Kokubu attended seminars in modern archaeology and ethnology. Once teaching at Tainan Girls' High School, he began to investigate historical remains and monuments in the region and gradually expanded his interest to ethnology and archaeology. For example, he surveyed the pot-worship culture of aboriginal Siraya villages and conducted fieldwork in the south and east of Taiwan and on offshore islands. He published his findings in scholarly journals in Taiwan and Japan.²⁷ This was the phase of Kokubu's self-training, since he had no university position and worked under no mentor.

Strictly speaking, Kokubu did not do his work alone but with a support group around him. This group consisted of Taiwanese literati and several Japanese high school teachers in Tainan. Among the teachers, MAEJIMA Shinji (前嶋信次, 1903–1983) of Tainan First High School was a history graduate of Tokyo Imperial University, and KANEKO Sueo (金子壽衛男, 1913–2001) of Tainan Second High School was a biology graduate of Tokyo Teachers' College. Maejima was first an assistant to the chair of East Asian history at Taihoku. After losing a promotion contest, he relocated to a high school in Tainan. There he began publications on local religion and geography, while continuing his interest in Arabic history that had started at Tokyo. After a few years in the 1940s working at the Investigation Bureau of the South Manchurian Railroad Company, he returned to academia, teaching at Keio University from 1950 until his retirement. He was awarded the Doctor of Letters for his work on Islamic history in 1953.²⁸ Interested in shell fossils and earth sciences, Kaneko made quite a few notable archeological discoveries while teaching in Tainan, often partnering with Kokubu. Kaneko is also known for taking interested high

²⁷ Kumamoto Daigaku Bungakubu Kōkōgaku Kenkyū Shitsu (ed.), *Kokubu Naoichi sensei nenpu* (The chronology of Professor Kokubu Naoichi) (Kumamoto, 1966), 18.

²⁸ Chen Jung-sheng, 'Qiandao xinci qiren qishi, II (Maejima Shinjin: who he was and what he did, part II)', *Taiwan yu haiyang Yazhou* (Taiwan and Oceanic Asia) (blog), December 24, 2008, <https://bit.ly/2NpU8P5>.

school students to do collections and small-scale excavations on the field.²⁹ Kaneko was later called to Taihoku to serve as a teaching assistant in geology, and was kept by the reorganized university after the war.³⁰

The cases of Maejima and Kaneko (and Kokubu as well) serve to make two points about the academic path of junior scholars in Japanese academia. First, some continued to do research on their own (or luckily with a support group) while they taught in high schools in regions with no university nearby. Though on their own, they had the research training from their undergraduate education to rely on. They published their findings in local or national venues. Second, the best of them won academic recognition with their publications and eventually gained (or regained) positions at universities, even rising to professorships.

Later, Kokubu was integrated into the research community in ethnology in Taipei. In 1939, he took part in excavations of shell mounds with Utsurikawa, Miyamoto, and the above-mentioned professor of anatomy, Kanaseki. When Kanaseki initiated a folklore study circle in Taipei and established the monthly journal *Minzoku Taiwan* (民俗台灣, Folklore Taiwan), Kokubu was one of the first contributors.³¹ In April 1943, Kokubu was appointed professor at Taipei Teachers' College and then became closely associated with Utsurikawa's institute. He was recruited to the reorganized university in Taipei after the war and continued his academic career in Japan after his repatriation.

The last mode of training, study abroad, was important for strengthening the junior scholar's foreign languages, broadening his international outlook, and expanding his intellectual network. It has been a tradition since the nineteenth century that junior Japanese academics studied abroad for a few years on government scholarships. In the first half of the twentieth century, the Ministry of Education regularly sent more than 50, and at one point more than 200, junior scholars abroad every year. Most of them received the scholarship when they were assistant professors.³² The humanists among them usually took courses with prominent

²⁹ Yao-kun He, 'Jinzi Shouweinan dui Taiwan ziran wenhuashi de gongxian (Kaneko Sueo's contribution to the natural history of Tainan)', *Tainan wenhua* (Tainan culture) 54 (2003), 144–51.

³⁰ Wei-Chi Chen, 'Zhishi de jieshou: Guofen zhiyi yu zhanhou chuqi de Taiwan yanjiu (Knowledge Retrieval: Kokubu Naoichi and Taiwanese studies in the early postwar era)', *Taida lishi xuebao* (Historical inquiry of the Department of History, National Taiwan University), 61 (2018), 103.

³¹ Kokubu published his ethnological studies on Taiwanese spirit medium beliefs and practices in southern Taiwan in 'Tankino kenkyu (Studies on the spirit medium)', *Minzoku Taiwan* (Ethnology of Taiwan), 1 (1941).

³² Naoto Tsuji, *Kindai Nihon kaigai ryūgaku no mokuteki hen'yō: Monbushō ryūgakusei no baken jittai nitsuite* (The Transformation of the Objectives of Overseas Study in Modern Japan: The Dispatches of Students Abroad by the Ministry of Education) (Tōkyō, 2010), 32–6.

professors or did library and archival research, often moving from one institution or country to another during the years of his scholarship. The scientists and physicians, in contrast, usually worked in a particular professor's laboratory throughout the time. Though few of them studied for a degree, their foreign experience was taken seriously as an important part of their academic portfolio if they wished to advance and become full professors at imperial universities. Taihoku replicated this model and secured the funding of Taiwan's Government-General for Murakami's and Iwao's tours of advanced study abroad, for example.

Two more points are important. First, a mature scholar did not necessarily complete all four modes of training. Only undergraduate education and apprenticeship were necessary. A lucky (and good) student might get a junior teaching position right after receiving his BA and then step by step reach the top academic echelon, without working outside the university. There were a small number who became professors without advanced study abroad. Second, the four modes did not constitute a specific sequence. The only certain element of all possible sequences was that undergraduate education came first. High school (or any other sub-university teaching) usually preceded university positions (if one could not get a university appointment directly out of school). But Maejima's case shows that junior university teaching might precede high school teaching, even though he later returned to the university. In some cases, study abroad might interrupt junior university teaching or come after the appointment to professorship.

The War and the Handover

Scholarly research was never an intellectual pursuit for its own sake in colonial Taiwan. As seen above, the founding of Taihoku Imperial University in general, and teaching and research in Southeast Asian history and ethnology of Taiwan specifically, were closely tied to Japan's colonial enterprise. As wars broke out, the university faculty was soon mobilized to help with the war effort. For example, Japan seized the eastern half of China shortly after the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937. The faculty of Taihoku was quickly enlisted, often by the military, to investigate the culture and natural resources in southeastern China, sometimes even to help restore the teaching and museum collections at Xiamen and Guangzhou universities.³³

³³ Miyamoto, *Wo de Taiwan jixing*, 169–76, 191–3.

Japan's political, military, and economic advances into Southeast Asia ensued. Taihoku created the Research Institute of Tropical Medicine in 1939 by upgrading the manpower and laboratory of an institute that had been previously placed under the Governor-General's Office. The need for medical, hygienic, and therapeutic knowledge for fighting tropical disease had been constant throughout Japan's rule of Taiwan. The new institute had an additional mission to apply its knowledge to Southeast Asia and to extend medical care for new plantation immigrants in the region. After the opening of the Pacific War in late 1941, Japan rapidly seized vast lands (including islands) in Southeast Asia. The economic development and governance of these lands became an urgent issue. This led to the creation of two more research institutes at Taihoku in 1943: the Research Institute on the Humanities of the South and the Scientific Institute on the Resources of the South. Utsurikawa headed the former, and promoted Miyamoto and Mabuchi to assistant professorships with new positions allocated to his institute. The increased resources and the political agenda behind them supported these scholars' expanding their ethnological work from Taiwan to southeastern China, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Indonesia.

While research and material investment seemed to expand, teaching at the university was interrupted, especially when the conditions on the Pacific fronts deteriorated. All male students were drafted into the military in 1944 and 1945. Only women students, who were very few, were able to stay. Even their study was disrupted by the university's closure in March 1925 as bombing by the US Air Force intensified.³⁴

A new, and at first chaotic, phase of Taiwanese history opened after Japan ceded Taiwan to China in August 1945 as a result of its defeat in World War II. At least three factors caused chaos for the university, which was reorganized and renamed National Taiwan University in January 1946. First, bombings during the war had destroyed many facilities. Shortage of building materials after the war made reconstruction difficult. Runaway inflation further crippled the reconstruction efforts.³⁵ Second, thousands of Taiwanese students who had studied in Japanese universities and high schools during the war returned to Taiwan after losing their legal residence (since Taiwan was no longer part of Japan). They requested access to the university—when there was only one in Taiwan. The situation further worsened with the arrival of Chinese students, also in thousands, who fled home for Taiwan when the Nationalist government seemed on the verge of losing the country to the Communist rebels. They

³⁴ Chou, 'Taibei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 53–4, 58.

³⁵ Ou, *Chuancheng yu chuangxin*, 29–32.

likewise requested admission to the university. As a result, the university accepted thousands of students, whereas the colonial university, elitist in nature, had only accommodated hundreds. Short of teaching resources, students even had to organize courses on their own.³⁶ Third, although the reorganized university hired to the faculty some Taiwanese who had been educated at prestigious Japanese institutions, there were not enough of them to fill the vacancies left by the Japanese faculty. Taiwanese rarely had academic ambition in the colonial period, knowing that racial discrimination gave them little chance for academic advancement. The vacancies at first could not be filled by scholars from China, either. Overjoyed by the victory after a long war, Chinese scholars hoped to return from where they were evacuated to their previous institutions and took part in national rebuilding. Few of them saw Taiwan, a remote and unfamiliar island, as their first choice. The shortage of faculty forced the university to adopt a policy of retention, keeping eighty-nine Japanese professors and instructors of various ranks.³⁷

Beyond the practical need of manpower, a Taiwanese intellectual, YANG Yun-Ping (楊雲萍, 1906–2000), justified this policy with what he called the takeover of historical materials and the takeover of history. He argued that taking over power from Japan was not sufficient. The Taiwanese should also take over the historical materials of Taiwan that the Japanese faculty had collected, ideally before their possible destruction and with full cooperation of the Japanese faculty. He also proposed to take over the power of historical interpretation, reevaluating the colonial experience.³⁸

Somewhat ironically, a stabilizing force in the chaotic university was the remaining Japanese faculty, who offered teaching that was consistent with the prewar quality and even continued to give research training to students, almost all of whom were Chinese and Taiwanese instead of Japanese in this postwar period. Miyamoto, one of the retained Japanese faculty, was joined by Kokubu of Taipei Teacher's College, who was appointed associate professor in the Department of History in 1947.³⁹ They both taught on the archaeology and ethnology of Taiwan, a specialty that no Chinese scholars were qualified to teach. In addition to teaching, Kokubu was put in charge of the reconstruction of the archaeological and ethnological museum from the prewar Institute of Ethnology. He restored the specimen

³⁶ Ibid, 103–25.

³⁷ Taihoku Imperial University at the time of the handover had 1,416 employees, including 114 chair professors. Chou, 'Taipei diguodaxue nanyangshi jiangzuo', 60–1.

³⁸ Yang's proposal was made in 1945, just months after Japan's surrender. Cited in Chen, 'Knowledge Retrieval', 99.

³⁹ The Japanese rank of assistant professor was replaced by that of associate professor in the reorganized university.

collections that had been badly damaged during the war, built up an inventory, and added captions for collected objects.⁴⁰ Kokubu used these specimens for his publications on indigenous material culture and prehistoric culture in Taiwan and for his lecture courses. Together, Miyamoto and Kokubu trained the first generation of Taiwanese archeologists and anthropologists who stayed in academia.

A Taiwanese student recalled his study with Miyamoto and Kokubu:

[When] I was admitted to the Department of History, I seldom went to freshman-year classes. Instead I was keen to audit Professor Kokubu's 'Introduction to Archaeology' and 'Introduction to Taiwan's Prehistory' courses as well as Professor Miyamoto's 'Ethnography of Taiwanese Aborigines' course. The two professors were so-called 'retained Japanese professors'. Because there were only two students at the senior level in the Department of History, Professors Kokubu and Miyamoto allowed me to join them. I told Professor Kokubu that in the future I would dedicate myself to archaeology. I felt that his lectures were given especially for me, which filled me with enthusiasm and joy.⁴¹

A student's lecture notes help reconstruct Kokubu's teaching. In his class Kokubu often compared history and archaeology. Both disciplines studied the history of human life. For him, the text of a letter concerned historians, while the physical letter, and traces on it (such as the kiss of the sender placed on the envelope) were artifacts that concerned archeologists.⁴² Historical studies were based on writing, whereas archeological work depended on analyses of excavation sites and physical artifacts. Besides the comparison of history and archaeology, he covered the history, methods, subfields, and periodization of archaeology. He demonstrated what he considered the objects of archaeology with the specimens in his museum, including stoneware, boneware, objects made of shell, pottery, plant remains, metal tools, and natural substances related to prehistoric food culture. He also related local culture and Stone Age culture by examining

⁴⁰ Chi-lu Chen, 'Tusu Yanjiu Zai Taiwan—Wei Taida Minzuxue Yanjiushi Biaoben Chenlieshi Xie (Ethnological Studies in Taiwan: The Story of the Museum of the Institute of Ethnology of the History Department)', *Gonglunpao* (Public Opinion Newspaper) (31 May 1948), 4 ed. Chen, 'The Takeover of Knowledge', 108.

⁴¹ Wen-Hsun Sung, 'Qianbei Fengfan (Exemplar forerunner)', in Nanjun Yang (ed.), *Taiwan bainian shuguang: Xueshu kaichuang shidai diaocha shilu* (The dawn of Taiwan in the past 100 years: a record of scholarly investigations in the time of academic expeditions) (Taipei City, 2005), ix–x.

⁴² Kanaseki once produced a series of drawings of Kokubu's everyday life in postwar Taipei, including Figure 16.1. See Takeo Kanaseki, *Kōgi tosuru Kokubu sensei, gakuseiwa futari* (Professor Kokubu in class, with two students), 1948, National Taiwan University Library, Papers of Professor Kanaseki Takeo <https://www.lib.ntu.edu.tw/events/2013_kanasekitakeo/painting.html>.



16.1 A Pictorial Depiction of Kokubu's Class. This picture shows the small size and intimacy of Kokubu's class. This apparently took place in a seminar room, in which a seminar table was placed in the middle, and bookshelves surrounded the space by the walls. (Digital Images of the KANASEKI Takeo Collection, Courtesy of National Taiwan University Library).

unearthed items—for example, shell bracelets—side by side with those still used in fishing villages in southern Taiwan.⁴³

Kokubu advocated comparative methods from several perspectives. He called the comparison of contemporary local culture with excavated artifacts the 'ethnographical method of archaeological research'. He also compared artifacts from one site with those from surrounding archaeological sites. This mapped out their geographical distribution and also sorted out their genealogy. These ethnographical, geographical, and genealogical comparisons, he asserted, held the key to Taiwan's prehistorical culture as well as all other prehistorical cultures in Southeast Asia.⁴⁴ Thus his courses were an introduction not just to the subjects of archaeology but also to its methods.

⁴³ Notes of Kokubu's archaeology course; see Wen-Hsun Sung, 'Transcription of Kokubu lecture on archaeology', 1947, Sung Wen-hsun Papers, National Taiwan University Library.

⁴⁴ Sung, 'Transcription of Kokubu lecture on archaeology', 16, 34. After his return to Japan, Kokubu developed a theory of ethno-archaeology in the 1960s by integrating his previous empirical work in archaeology and ethnology. See Naoichi Kokubu, *Kan shinakai minzoku bunka kō* (Studies of ethnic cultures around the China Sea) (Tokyo, 1976), 8–18.

Kokubu's 'Overview of Taiwan's Prehistory' course introduced pre-historical life in Taiwan by applying theories to excavated objects. Kokubu advocated the idea that Taiwan had been the center of Greater East Asia since the Stone Age. It was at the crossroads of northbound, southbound, and continent-to-the-Pacific routes. The history of Taiwan did not begin with the first Chinese immigrants, but with Stone Age peoples who lived either on the coast or on hills near rivers. The culture of Taiwan resulted from the convergence of southern, continental, and northern cultures.⁴⁵

Continuing archaeological work after the war, Kokubu trained his students in the field. As he did with students in high school and teachers' college, Kokubu took university students to several excavations in central and northern Taiwan during winter and summer vacations in 1948 and 1949.⁴⁶ Some of these sites had been discovered during Japanese rule, while others were first excavated by his team.⁴⁷ His teaching thus trained students in both intellectual and practical skills in archaeology.

The new authorities in Taiwan became increasingly intolerant, or suspicious, of the Japanese retainees, particularly after the violent confrontations between the Taiwanese population and the new Chinese authority that led to a bloody massacre in 1947. Feeling insecure, the new authorities tried their best to keep all resources, including faculty positions at the university, for their Chinese confidantes. Then the civil war between the Nationalist government and the Communist rebels intensified in the Chinese mainland, eventually resulting in the retreat of the Nationalist government and its army to Taiwan. Along with them came a considerable number of academics who chose the Nationalists over the Communists. Their arrivals left no more room for the retention policy. All but a very few number of exceptions among the remaining Japanese faculty were forced to leave Taiwan in 1949, closing a chapter of research education in Taiwanese history.

⁴⁵ See Wen-Hsun Sung, 'Transcription of "Xianshi shidai de Taiwan gaishuo" (Overview of Taiwan prehistory)', 153–61, Sung Wen-hsun Papers, National Taiwan University Library.

⁴⁶ The sites Kokubu and his students surveyed were mostly near Taipei and Taiwan's northern coastal areas. For his archaeological journals and field notes concerning these small-scale investigations see Naoichi Kokubu, 'Saishuki (Notes on Collection)', n.d., Kokubu Papers, National Taiwan University Library; Naoichi Kokubu, 'Archeology', n.d., Kokubu Papers, National Taiwan University Library.

⁴⁷ Kokubu coauthored with Kanaseki Takeo a paper for the Japanese Society of Ethnology in 1950 that described the archaeological surveys in Taiwan from 1945 to 1949. See Takeo Kanaseki and Naoichi Kokubu, 'Taiwan senshi kōkogaku niokeru kinnen no Kōsaku (Recent studies in prehistoric archaeology of Formosa)', *Minzokugaku Kenkyū* (Japanese journal of ethnology), 18 (1950), 67–80.

Conclusion

This chapter has analyzed research education in colonial Taiwan during the interwar period, based on a survey of the context of the founding and organization of Taihoku Imperial University and on a selective review of the careers of its teaching staff. The analysis identifies four modes of research training at work. The first mode was undergraduate training, the only formal research education that Japanese universities, including Taihoku, offered. The students majoring in Southeast Asian history at Taihoku, for example, studied multiple languages, learned primary research using the languages, and applied their research to a degree thesis. The second mode was apprenticeship. All junior members of the teaching staff helped professors with teaching and research. They learned their trade by completing assignments under the professor's direction and close supervision. The third mode was self-training, applicable to scholars who taught at non-university institutions, especially in a region with no university. They used their time after teaching to collect historical material, do fieldwork, make small-scale excavations, and write and publish their findings. Some of them gained junior university positions with their active research and publications. The fourth mode was study abroad, available to a select few who went overseas, often on government scholarships. A portion of the Japanese professors were kept to provide teaching after Taiwan's handover to China; they continued to train Taiwanese students in their undergraduate classes and in the field during the transitional period of 1945–48.

The efficacy or success of the research training at Taihoku can be judged by the career development of the junior members of its teaching staff. Apprenticeship worked to the degree that most of the junior members moved up in the ranks when openings became available (with the exception of Maejima). More significantly, some of them acquired chairs at the foremost Japanese universities. Iwao became a professor at Tokyo, the flagship university of Japan, and Yani had a chair at Kyushu University, also a respectable institution that was once an imperial university, and after the war one of the 'Seven National Universities'. The first lecturer in national history, KOBATA Atsushi (小葉田淳, 1905–2001), ended up as a professor at Kyoto, the rival to Tokyo. The first assistant professor of East Asian history, KUWATA Rokuto (桑田六郎, 1894–1987), became a professor at Osaka, also one of the Seven National Universities.

Some of those who trained themselves in sub-university teaching positions also made good career advancements. As seen above, Kaneko was appointed at Taihoku as assistant and then lecturer before the war. Kokubu became an associate professor after the war. Maejima became a professor at Keio.

The success of Taihoku's undergraduate training for academic careers in Japan is harder to judge. The most successful academic among Taihoku's history graduates was probably Mabuchi. He was in the first class of Taihoku students and became an assistant professor at Taihoku in 1943. He retired from Tokyo Metropolitan University as a professor. Another success story was NAKAMURA Takashi (中村孝志, 1910–1994). A Japanese born in Taiwan, Nakamura graduated as a Southeast Asian history major from Taihoku in 1935, was employed by the Investigation Bureau of the South Manchurian Railroad Company before the war, and retired as a professor at Tenri University, a private university in Japan, after the war.⁴⁸ Thus, Taihoku's history department produced two professors out of a total of thirty-three graduates—not a bad rate.

On the other hand, none of the Taihoku history graduates landed a position at any of the foremost universities in metropolitan Japan, even after the war. This may have had less to do with the quality of Taihoku's research training than with Japanese academia's preoccupation with intellectual pedigree. To be a professor at one of the top universities, a junior scholar had to have graduated first or at least second in his class at one of those universities. In fact, all the junior members of Taihoku's teaching staff who later gained professorships at leading Japanese institutions were Tokyo or at least Kyoto graduates. In spite of Taihoku's great resources and solid undergraduate education, the university in the colony still did not belong to Japan's 'Ivy League', so to speak. Its graduates had virtually no access to faculty positions in that league.

The case for Taiwanese students after the war was very different. Before the war, it was very difficult for colonial subjects to become university instructors, even though a very small number of them overcame the difficulty. This explains why the only two Taiwanese history graduates in the colonial period did not venture an academic career. Things changed dramatically after the war, especially after the Nationalist government fled to Taiwan. Taipei was no longer the periphery. Instead, it had become the metropole. At that time, the university in Taipei was the only one in Taiwan, and it has remained the foremost academic institution even up to today. The students it trained became the elite of Taiwanese academia. Wen-Hsun SUNG (1924–2016), Bing-Hsiung LIU (1925–2004), and Ting-Jui HO (1923–2014), Taiwanese students who entered the university immediately following the war, gained teaching positions at National Taiwan University and at Academia Sinica, the leading research institution in Taiwan. Though trained by the retained Japanese Miyamoto and Kokubu, they formed the first generation of Taiwanese who had successful

⁴⁸ Chou, 'Nanyō-shi as Research Chair and as a Major', 47, 49.

academic careers at the foremost institutions in Taiwan.⁴⁹ They based their work very much on the material and methods that their Japanese teachers imparted to them. Their specialty in the ethnology of Taiwan was still indispensable even to the new rulers for governing the aboriginals, making these scholars irreplaceable by their Chinese teachers or peers in the first decades after the war.

This is not to say that their Chinese teachers were not important in their intellectual formation. The junior Taiwanese scholars also benefited from the teaching of the Chinese faculty who had just retreated to Taiwan. Some of them were the most accomplished historians, anthropologists, and archeologists of their generation. Nonetheless, they came with their political, cultural, and linguistic preferences, creating delicate and often unspoken tensions between them and their Taiwanese students (and the Taiwanese population at large). They preferred Chinese history to Taiwanese history and Southeast Asian history, for instance, at a time when their minds were set on reacquiring China. Therefore, the first postwar Taiwanese graduates of the university did not advance on the academic path in the history department as well as their peers did in the program that became the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology. The new generation of academic historians in Taiwan, however, belongs to another study.

Academia Sinica, Taiwan

National Taiwan University

Academia Sinica, Taiwan

⁴⁹ They were joined by Taiwanese who were educated in Japan or China and returned to Taiwan as junior scholars or students at the reorganized university, such as Yun-Ping Yang, Chi-Lu Chen (1923–2014), and Chih-wan Liu (1923–2018).